

# THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

VOL. III.

JUNE, 1903.

NO. 12.

## The Possibilities of Socialism in China.

**T**HE internationalism of socialist doctrines is proven again by the fact that a socialist movement has already been launched in China—not by missionaries from Europe or America, but by Chinese scholars and reformers. Reports of socialist propaganda are regularly received from all parts of Europe, from South Africa, South America, Australasia and Japan, but China has, up to the present, been unheard from.

There are probably 100,000 Chinese in America, the chief centers being San Francisco, California and Victoria, British Columbia. Efforts to explain the principles of socialism to the Asiatics in Canada have been futile, owing to their limited knowledge of the English language. The recent visit to America of the great Chinese reformer, Leung Kai Chew, afforded an opportunity, however, of securing and giving information, the results of which I will briefly outline.

Leung Kai Chew is an exile from China, having been a warm friend of the late emperor. He is now editor of "Sien Min Choong Boa," published in Yokohama, Japan, his visit to America being in the interests of the Chinese Reform Association, of which he is honorary vice president. As an educationalist, author, historian, etc, Mr. Leung (to use his name in the "civilized" manner) is in the front rank of Chinese notables, although he appears to be only about 35 years of age.

An interview was easily secured as soon as Mr. Leung was informed by his interpreter, Kang Yu Wei, that socialism was the topic on which information was desired. As an introductory Mr. Leung was handed copies of the Seattle and Vancouver socialist publications and a brief description of the growth and strength of socialism as an international political working-class movement was given in writing. In addition to this the principles of collectivism and the class-struggle were explained and a series of questions were asked regarding the possibilities of a movement being established in China.

Before allowing himself to be interviewed Mr. Leung proved his capability as a political leader by interviewing the interviewer. He stated that he had read books written by Karl Marx, Proudhon and St. Simon and that a Chinese translation of Marx's greatest work, "Capital," is almost completed. It will be published during the present year. He is a friend of Sen Katayama, publisher of the "Socialist," Tokio, Japan, and reports the socialist movement to be very strong in the Tokyo district. Yano, formerly Japanese ambassador to China, has just published a novel similar to Bellamy's "Equality."

Mr. Leung first desired to know where socialism was strongest and as to the strength in the various countries. These questions were followed by others, asking if socialism was like Plato's "Ideal Republic," and if its American advocates believed in "dividing up." "Is socialism connected with Nihilism?" "Do you favor the plan of profit-sharing?" "Are you connected with the trades unions?" "Do you endorse labor strikes?" "What is your attitude on the question of Chinese exclusion?" "How can the workers get larger wages and yet work only three or four hours per day?" "How will you take over the railroads and other large industries?"

The variety of questions above enumerated afforded an excellent opportunity to supply information—an occupation all socialist agitators enjoy. The wonderful growth of the socialist vote in America and Germany; the fact that idealists had painted many word-pictures of better systems of society, but at no stage in history until the present was socialism possible; that socialism will end the present system of "dividing up" under which the capitalist takes \$5 out of every \$6 produced by labor; that socialism is rapidly displacing Nihilism in Russia; that profit-sharing is a reactionary palliative and co-operative stores only make it possible for the workers to live on smaller wages; that while the socialist party endorses the labor unions and strikes as the industrial weapon of the working class we realize that the capitalistic judges have put the unions up against a stone wall and the political strike at the ballot box is the only weapon left for the worker; that Chinese exclusion laws are unworkable, as the capitalists will buy their labor power in the cheapest market and even though the capitalist government and courts enforced such a law the capitalists would merely take the factory to the worker in China, instead of bringing the Chinese cheap labor to the factory in America; that the use of labor-saving machinery, the abolition of useless labor, such as advertising, commercial travelers, bookkeeping, etc., as shown by the trusts would make it possible for the worker to decrease his hours of labor fully two-thirds and by securing the full product of his toil have all his de-



sires satisfied; and that while some socialists favored expropriation and compensation, others contended that as labor had produced all wealth under a socialist state, labor should merely take control of industry and decree that in future all members of society should perform productive labor—compensation would result in establishing a class of parasites living on interest.

The above points were touched upon in answer to the questions, Mr. Leung making the comment that it was good doctrine, but would probably take a century for socialism to be established universally throughout the world. The illustration was made that just as an avalanche starts as a snowball on the top of a mountain, gathering more snow and more speed as it glides on its downward path, so will the socialist vote and industrial revolution gather speed and reach its climax much sooner than present conditions indicate.

In replying to the writer's questions Mr. Leung stated that one of his books, "Socialism between the Chinese and other Asiatic Races," was a comparison of Karl Marx's writings with those of Confucius, Mencius, Suentsi and Wong Le Chew, all of whose writings in Chinese were very socialistic. No socialist candidates have ever been nominated in China for the simple reason that no elections are held in that country for municipal or national offices. He was favorable to the organization of a socialist party in China as soon as a constitutional government could be established.

The Chinese reform movement aimed at securing a new constitution with a democratic government elected by the people themselves. For the present all that could be done in the way of socialist propaganda would be the establishment of a socialist literature. He had already published many extracts from Marx's writings in his paper, which had a circulation of 30,000 in all parts of China, but chiefly in the sea ports. Legally there is no freedom of the press, but the government is too weak to prevent the circulation of reform papers. It is unsafe, however, to hold lectures or public meetings other than in the treaty ports. Something might be done to educate the Chinese in America along socialist lines, but he could recommend no specific plan.

No caste system exists in China to prevent the growth of socialist teachings. The caste system was abolished 25 centuries ago, according to Mr. Leung, and to-day a Chinaman might be a poor laborer, to-morrow he might be rich and he could even become a noble if he is willing to pay the price. In this respect the Chinese is "alleesamee Melican man."

The Chinese reform movement, like socialism, has nothing to do with religion. It is purely political and is revolutionary in the sense that it aims to overthrow the present despotism and

establish democracy. In reply to a question from a socialist lady who was present, Mr. Leung said that the Chinese looked upon the women as equals to the men in every respect and if his cause triumphs and a new constitution is written for the Chinese empire it will provide for equal suffrage for both sexes. The Boxer movement had no good objects. It was started by robbers and encouraged by disloyal officials.

The Chinese reformer expressed a desire to keep himself informed upon the socialist movement and a list of addresses of leading socialists throughout the world was supplied him together with a number of small pamphlets and the following books: "Merrie England," "Leibknecht's "Socialism," Benham's "Peru Before the Conquest," Engel's "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," Leibknecht's "No Compromise, No Political Trading," "Socialist Campaign Book," Kautsky's "Social Revolution," and Vandewelde's "Collectivism." Some of these will undoubtedly be translated into Chinese and the work of sowing the right kind of seed in preparation for the harvest to come will go on until the industrial evolution advances far enough to gather the monster China into the socialist revolution.

*G. Weston Wrigley,*  
Victoria, British Columbia.

### Some Free Legal Advice.

**T**HE trade unions see trouble ahead. The capitalists scheme to capture or tie up the labor war chests. How to protect them? While ultimately the solution of the problem merges in the general economic and political struggle, it presents some interesting legal phases. No doubt the trade unions will have abundant legal advice of competent legal talent. But this is no reason why suggestions should not come from outside of the limited circle of legal talent. Every one should contribute his mite. Ignorance of the law excuses no one—is a sound legal maxim. In our very ignorance, we may blunder, like the philosophers of ancient Greece, on a solution which may not occur to better informed minds.

The situation is this:

A trade union orders a strike, or a boycott, or in some other way interferes with the business of some employer, with the result that he suffers damages. The employer brings an action for damages against the union and recovers a verdict. Nothing wrong about this. The verdict against the union is in accord with the law—the capitalist law—of the land, and any other verdict would be a revolutionary verdict, which no capitalist judge can, will or should render, since he was not elected to do so. This, I repeat, is the capitalist-made law of the land, to which there are many exceptions, some of which I shall point out later. I contend that the unions have no ground for complaint. Given that the capitalist system is right and should be maintained, then the capitalist is entitled to the full protection of the law against any interference from any person or group of persons with his right to pursue any lawful occupation or enter into any lawful contracts with any person or persons. Let A be the capitalist. A has a right to establish a shop or factory and may hire people to work for him on terms mutually agreed upon and if B interferes with his right to conduct such shop or factory or with his right to enter into a “free” contract of employment with any person, and such interference results in damages to A, then A may hail B before a court of justice and B is sure to be mulcted in damages for the benefit of A. It makes not a particle of difference whether B is a natural person, a trade union or a corporation.

A’s right to recover or his remedy against B may be made nugatory in the following instances, which are some of the exceptions to which I have alluded before:

a. Where B is the State and interferes in the exercise of its police powers.



b. Where B is one, several or all of the persons with whom A entered into relations of employment.

c. Where, while A's right to recover against B is not questioned, B's property is exempt from execution and placed beyond the reach of legal process on the ground of public policy.

Let us examine the propositions a, b and c.

Proposition a. All factory and tenement house laws owe their validity to the principle and the vast authority exercised by the Board of Health derives its sanction from the police powers vested in the State.

Proposition b. B may leave or threaten to leave the employment of A at any time, provided he is not under a contract of employment, and B will not be responsible for damages which he may cause thereby to A. And what one may lawfully do, several may lawfully combine to do. Several or all employes of A may combine and leave or threaten to leave the employment of A without becoming responsible for the damages resulting to A. If this proposition is correct, then it follows that if a trade union and its officers are composed of employes of A, it may do with impunity what would be actionable if it included other persons and its officers were outsiders. For then it would become a third and "interfering" party. To this general rule there are numerous exceptions and distinctions. Whether the courts will in the future follow the general rule or be guided by exceptions and distinctions no one can foretell. It all depends on the election returns, as Mr. Dooley has pointed out long ago. I merely offer some suggestions, and if the courts will hold differently, well, then I have made a bad forecast of the political weather.

Proposition c. Most people are familiar with the laws making certain property—household furniture, tools and homestead of certain value—exempt from seizure and sale for debt. The statutes of exemption are founded on the principle of public policy that it is not in the interest of the public and even the class of creditors, to strip the debtor of all means of earning a livelihood.

The principle of exemption of property from execution is at this moment of great interest to the trade unions. We will all admit that a law making union funds exempt from execution would be desirable. Assuming that the trade unions are powerful enough to force such a law through Congress or several legislatures, would not such law be set aside by the courts as unconstitutional? For we must not forget that in this country, unlike to England where judicial legislation is as rare as royal veto, the courts have always the last word to say. At first glance it seems that such a law would have no constitutional leg to stand upon. But upon closer inquiry the case appears less hopeless. The form under which this law is advocated—exemption of union

funds—is certainly objectionable. The objections which are likely to be urged against such a law would be: 1, that it is class legislation; 2, that the beneficiary is not a natural person; 3, that the exempted property and its intended use are not clearly described and the reasons for the exemption are indefinite. The first objection may be avoided by making the provision of the law general. The funds should be identified not by ownership, but by use. Bankers, brokers and lawyers may have their out-of-work funds. In answer to the second objection it will suffice to point out that the State exempts freely religious, educational and benevolent institutions from taxation, which, in fact means that it taxes other persons and organizations for their benefit. The third objection may be obviated by a definite designation in the statute of exemption of the particular funds exempted. So funds intended to assist men out of work by reason of sickness, or idleness caused by slack in the trade or strike may be designated as Unemployed Mutual Aid Fund or Out-of-work Insurance Fund. Indeed, it will require no unusual stretching of the principle of public policy to maintain the constitutionality of the statute exempting such funds. For it can be argued with force and reason that such a statute would tend to encourage the workingmen to save and set aside part of their earnings as an insurance fund to be used in case of sickness or idleness, which they will not be likely to do in the same measure if such funds may at any time be attached or levied upon, in which case the support of idle workingmen and their families would devolve on the community. Certainly, such law will undoubtedly demand that the funds may not be applied to any other purpose except as designated, but with that the unions can easily put up. Expenses necessary for the maintaining of offices, etc., may be met out of a minor fund that will tempt no litigation.

These suggestions are offered as a loophole through which the trade union war chests may escape the sheriff.

Another question arises. A statute exempting trade union funds, if passed, will undoubtedly provide for the incorporation of the body in control of the funds. Shall trade unions incorporate? It is my opinion that incorporation of trade unions on a large scale would be disastrous to the labor movement. The reasons for this view I shall give in another article. But a statute exempting union funds will create the only conditions under which a trade union may hold, control and use its funds for a certain purpose through an incorporated body. I say *through* an incorporated body. For the corporation should be a sort of an auxiliary body. The trade union itself should remain unincorporated, but every member, by joining the union, purchases a policy of insurance in the Out-of-Work Fund.

The strike funds are usually accumulated more from voluntary contributions than collection of dues. The law should authorise the collection and use of such funds. The term of out-of-work benefit must also be limited, but may be extended indefinitely by a majority vote of the policy holders.

*Julian.*



## Labor Politics in Great Britain.

**D**URING the past three years a remarkable change has come over the spirit of organized labor in Great Britain. Three years ago the trade union movement in this country stood shivering and doubting on the brink of politics. Its ears were filled with the din of socialist propaganda as carried on mainly by the Independent Labor Party in the provinces and the Social Democratic Federation in London; around it was the menace of marshalled capital growing into syndicates and trusts, and the first rumblings of the general attack on labor combinations, which has since been made through the press and in the law courts, were being heard. The Liberal party which, in spite of the defections of Conservatism of nearly every industrial center in the country, had managed to keep alive its claim to be the political custodian of the workers' well-being was split and dumb. Almost against its will, the Trade Union Congress, which met in Plymouth in September, 1899, resolved that an attempt should be made to co-operate with the socialists for political purposes. The pressure of events from without, rather than the enlightenment of wisdom from within, forced the trade union movement to enter politics as a party by itself, and cease to trust exclusively to the kindness, the sympathy and the support of either Liberals or Conservatives.

In the previous issue of this REVIEW, I have written of the first attempts to build up this new political movement, and on the editor's invitation I return to the subject. I do so all the more readily because the annual conference just held at Newcastle marks an important point in the life of the committee. It has suddenly grown from a babe to a giant. Two years ago, the Social Democratic Federation ceased to co-operate because, it alleged, the committee was not receiving sufficient support from the trade unions. What that support has been, the following table, setting out the number and membership of the affiliated trade unions, the number of affiliated trades councils, and the number and membership of the affiliated socialist societies, will show:

	T.U.'s.		T.C.'s		Soc. S's.		Increase.	
	No.	M'ship.	No.	No.	M'ship.	Total.	per cent.	
1900-1 .....	41	353,070	7	3	22,861	375,931	—	
1901-2 .....	65	455,450	21	2	13,861	469,311	24.83	
1902-3 .....	127	847,315	49	2	13,835	861,150	83.5	

It must be noted that the membership returned in this table does not include trades councils, and the only duplication occurs

in the numbers of the socialist societies, which are partly included in the trade union totals. If the part of the membership of trade councils which does not belong to trade unions affiliated to the committee were added to these figures, the Newcastle conference can be said to have represented a million workers.

But even that figure minimises the significance of the movement. For it does not include the membership of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, nor the membership of a Scottish Committee, which deals exclusively with Scottish constituencies. The miners occupy a peculiar position. When the old Labor Representation League ran its labor candidates in 1874, the only two who were successful were miners, and when the Liberals made peace, for the time being, with that old League and brought it to an end, the miners' representatives were content to ally themselves with the Liberal party and, to this day, the one trade union staffed by Liberals and led by Liberal-labor officers is the Miners' Federation. Some of the district sections of the Federation would be quite willing to join the Labor Representation Committee, but the opposition of the central board has, as yet, been too strong. But a concession has had to be made, and Mr. Pickard, M. P., foreseeing the strength of the Labor Representation Committee, encouraged his members to vote for a parliamentary fund of their own, and boasted that the Federation could run seventy candidates itself. The members of the Federation are, in consequence, paying a special levy of one shilling per annum into a Miners' Parliamentary Fund and are preparing to run a certain number of candidates at the next election. That being so the membership of the Miners' Federation may properly be added to that of the Labor Representation Committee when one desires to give a true impression of the position of the labor representation movement; and when that is done it is found that the trade unionists who are now paying into parliamentary funds number at least 1,300,000—a larger number than is represented at the annual trade union congresses, which have been regarded as the most important gatherings of labor in this country. So much for the numerical strength of the movement.

What now, of its policy? Here again the Newcastle conference marks a definite step. The Labor Representation Committee was always understood to be independent, but there was an impression abroad that its independence was only nominal, and the Liberals had not ceased to hope that the Committee was only to be another agency for returning Liberal members to parliament. When a workman is returned to the House of Commons he becomes the center of a whirlwind of temptation. He generally catches the House of Commons fever, known to the man in the street as "swollen head," and the return of trade union officials—

some of whom have but little grasp of political problems outside the matters concerning their own industry—is of course a risky thing to promote if one has any systematic idea of the work of a labor party in parliament. The Committee has had its experiences in this respect. One of its four M. P.s is to this day asking the electors to admire him as opposed to the others because he is wise enough to support Conservatives, Liberal-Unionists, Liberals and Socialists at elections. Thus, he claims, he is gaining the maximum support for labor demands. This aberration of intellect and unfortunate lack of humor must always be expected from men who have to pick up an elementary knowledge of citizenship after they have been sent to the House of Commons, and when they go there as free lances before party discipline and loyalty are either understood or established.

This is one of the most threatening dangers ahead of the Committee. The old capitalist parties first adopted the policy of pooh-poohing the movement. Then they found it was serious and hoped to entangle it. A resolution definitely declaring for independence passed by 690,000 votes to 140,000 at Newcastle put an end to that hope. Now they are trying to detach one or two men, trying to get them to split up the movement, trying to cajole labor's own paid officials to strike the death blow to labor's most hopeful attempt at self emancipation. They will not succeed. The other three members of parliament elected under the auspices of the Committee (Mr. J. Keir Hardie, Mr. D. J. Shackleton and Mr. Will Crooks) understand the basis of the Committee and have not been cajoled either by the flattery of the press nor by invitations to dine out. At the next election, come when it may, at least twenty constituencies will be fought by our candidates without Liberal opposition, partly because the Liberals cannot afford to fight us and partly because the rank and file of Liberal electors are inoculated with the labor party views; and altogether thirty or forty of our candidates will go to the poll. It is always unsafe to prophecy the result of elections. But nine months ago, Mr. Shackleton running as an independent labor candidate and the nominee of the Trade Unions Independent Labor Party in the Clitheroe division was elected unopposed; whilst last month Woolwich elected the Committee's candidate, Mr. Crooks, and turned a Conservative majority of nearly 3,000 into a labor majority of 3,200. These elections, together with the present drift of public opinion, justify us in hoping that as a result of the general election a sufficient number of our candidates will be returned to constitute a most effective fighting group in the House of Commons.

With the exception of the Miners' Federation every trade union of any importance or size in the country is affiliated to the



Labor Representation Committee and is paying fees annually of 10s per thousand members. From this source the income of the Committee has been as follows: In 1900-01, £215; 1901-02, £225; 1902-03, £527.

But that is only an infinitesimal part of the money that is being spent in advancing Labor Representation. Societies like the Railway Servants are levying their members 1s per annum for parliamentary purposes, and it is reckoned that two years from now at least £50,000 will be passing each year into special political funds held by trade unions and the Labor Representation Committee. This is the most important feature of the present movement. It is built upon a financial foundation. The workers are finding their own parliamentary funds by an accumulation of coppers. The thing has never been done before. Belgium can draw upon profits made over the counters of co-operative stores, and Germany has newspapers trading profits. We, on the other hand, have no indirect income. We have devised a scheme by which we go straight to the workman, tell him *what* we want and get it from him.

The method which we have devised is as follows: Candidates for parliament must be members of affiliated societies, but as the Independent Labor Party is affiliated, socialists pure and simple, who have no trade union connection (people like myself for instance) have every opportunity of entering parliament as members of the labor group and of influencing the work of the Committee. As a result of the Committee's existence, the leading trade unions have resolved to find the expenses of candidates and to maintain them if elected to the House of Commons, and it has been clearly laid down by the recent conference at Newcastle that these candidates must be independent of both the Liberal and the Conservative parties and that they must be known purely and simply as labor candidates.

A section of the Socialists look upon the Committee with misgivings, but the Independent Labor Party co-operates harmoniously. The view of that party is that so long as the Committee keeps clear of Liberalism and Toryism and stands for labor interests, not only is it aiding the general increase of labor economic and political power, but it is preventing the trade union movement from going astray as it has already done after false political leaders. We are not afraid of socialism catching cold in this country; we are not afraid of co-operating, as socialists, in movements which are purely working class and which deal with the economic and political condition of the workers from an independent standpoint. We know that such movements must inevitably tend to socialism. So long as they do not hamper us in our own socialist propaganda, so long as we are frankly admitted into their

councils, so long as their platform is genuinely a common one upon which all independent labor sections can meet, the Independent Labor Party and its socialist membership will support such movements in spite of the opposition of a handful of more timorous and dogmatic socialists. We are even not particularly anxious to hasten the time when the Labor Representation Committee shall pass a socialist resolution. Such a resolution was very nearly passed at Newcastle. But as yet, the Committee has not emerged from the experimental stage, and it is much better that the men of influence in the unions should be forced by the logic of events to recognize the wisdom of the socialist position than that that position should be passed at an annual conference of the Committee by a bare majority. The Independent Labor Party think it better that the Committee should be taught socialism by its experience. That is, perhaps, an insularly English position. It recognizes, however, the special circumstances of English politics, and it is a most extraordinary coincidence that the year which has marked the almost phenomenal growth of the Labor Representation Committee has also been marked by the greatest number of socialist successes at municipal elections, the largest annual conference which the Independent Labor Party has ever had, and the issue of a balance sheet by that party showing the largest annual income ever collected by it, and a complete freedom from debt—a position in which it has not been for ten years. There cannot be the least doubt but that the work of this Committee has greatly stimulated the socialist movement in England.

The Committee is now engaged in getting together an efficient Parliamentary Fund by regular levies from its affiliated societies. From this fund, it proposes to pay its members of parliament a sum of £200 per session and to find one-fourth of the election costs of the returning officer. Over a hundred societies have already decided to subscribe one penny per annum per member to this fund and when the subscriptions are fully coming in this modest per capita levy will yield about £3,000 annually. This is quite apart from the ordinary office income and will be held as a separate trust fund to be used for parliamentary purposes only.

But all this is only laying foundations. The superstructure, I hope, will be a fully equipped *Parti Ouvrier*, which will place us in England in as proud a position as is occupied by our fellow socialists in Germany, Belgium or France.

*J. Ramsey MacDonald,*

*Member of the London County Council, Secretary of the Labor Representation Committee.*

### Just To Think.



JUST to think of millions toiling,  
Day by day,  
For whatever the lordly masters  
Choose to pay,  
Sets the thinker's blood a-boiling  
Till he vows that this despoiling—  
Come what may  
In the shape of new disasters—  
Has to stop,  
Has to stop.

Just to think of children dying  
In the slums,—  
In that hell much worse than devil's,—  
Soon benumbs  
Fellow-feeling for those crying  
"We on rich men are relying  
For some crumbs,  
Don't disturb the rich man's revels  
Or we'll starve,  
Or we'll starve."

Just to think of those same revels  
And their cost,—  
Cost in cash and kindly feeling,—  
Worse than lost,—  
All contentment soon dishevels;  
Then one cries, "Incarnate devils  
More had tost  
To appealing wretches kneeling  
For relief,  
For relief.

Just to think of starving millions  
Makes one curse.  
Curse the social competition  
So averse  
To an equal chance at trillions  
Earth has stored for human billions  
To disperse;  
Loudly curse the weak ambition  
To be rich,  
To be rich.



Just to think of God in Heaven  
And of men,  
Makes one want to know the reason,  
Now and then,  
Why it is one God or seven  
Can't keep working righteous leaven  
In man when  
Greed incites to theft or treason.  
Can you tell,  
Can you tell?

Just to think of earth's perfection  
If all shared  
Free and equal in earth's treasures!  
If all dared  
To renounce—past resurrection—  
Greed, and warfare's insurrection!  
Were we spared,  
For one day, unequal pleasures:  
Just to think,  
Just to think!

—*Edwin Arnold Brenholtz.*

## The Revolt of the Artist.



WE are nearing the close of a period which began in an emotional revolt, the frank object was the return to nature, the shaking off the shackles of conventionality, and the being of all hazards, frankly and freely natural, a period which has in its decline flatly contradicted the promise of its youth, and is ending in artificiality and sensationalism.

Emotional revolt, for the Anglo-Saxon, began about the middle of the last century. The intervening years between the close of the eighteenth century and that revolt, which was in effect the beginning of modern art life, were occupied in settling the confusion incident upon the struggles of the preceding century. It was a time of sordid money-getting. The only relief to its universal meanness was to be found in the pioneers, who going forth into the wilderness redeemed for men those waste places, which have since become so important and which now give promise of becoming dominating factors in the affairs of the world.

Succeeding this period of artistic barrenness an epoch dawned in which ardent hope and fierce revolt were manifest. Revolt intellectual, religious, political and consequently artistic dominated all its manifestations. The promises of the great revolution were called upon for fulfillment, the democracy armed itself, and authority tottered on its pedestal.

In 1847 Emerson visited England and it is evident that what he saw there inspired him with much appreciation and with many forebodings, for he says:

"In the absence of the highest aims of the pure love of knowledge and the surrender to nature, there is the suppression of the imagination, the priapism of the senses and the understanding. We have the factitious instead of the natural, tasteless expense, arts of comfort, and the rewarding as an illustrious inventor whosoever will contrive to introduce one impediment more between the man and his object." (*English Traits*.)

The complaints of Carlyle were still more savage than those of Emerson, until grown weary of his own enigmatic scolding, the great dyspeptic degenerated into a noisy apostle of fate, a "mad mullah" ruined by too little exercise and too much porridge.

But Emerson does not appear to have been able to explain the sterility and apathy, which he saw so clearly. His sympathies were all with the great industrial revolution, for as a citizen of a republic he was bound to rejoice in the promise of greater

equality, which, it appeared to him, must necessarily follow from it.

He speaks of the social change in terms of distinct approval. Thus we find him saying:

"The great powers of industrial art have no exclusion of name or blood. The tools of our time, namely steam, ships, printing, money, and popular education belong to those who can handle them and the effect has been that advantages once confined to men of family are now open to the entire middle class." (*English Traits*.)

The economic effects of the bourgeois revolt were in many respects sad and indeed cruel, but its intellectual and artistic possibilities had not yet made themselves felt. The disappearance of classicism was not yet recognized, and the feeble ghosts of its departed glories still stalked about the land. Turner, Lawrence and Constable overshadowed all, and their influence discouraged, so that the time was well-ripe for a rebellion against artificial authority. No poet had given out a new message, for Tennyson, the pianist of poetry, expresses little more than elegant conventionalities, wonderfully ornamental and particularly well-attuned to catch the ear of those in authority.

Browning, almost contemporary with this period of more or less latent revolt, which flickered and smouldered in riots, Chartist programs and Irish famines, subsequently flared into open rebellion and sedition on the European continent, and culminated in the United States, in the wildest and fiercest struggle of modern times, published *Pauline and Luria* before 1850. His poems, however, cannot be regarded as in any sense instigators or promoters of the new movement. The fundamental philosophy of his writings was not evident to the men of his times, so bound were they by conventionality and formalism.

Thackeray, it is true, satirised and flayed the aristocracy, but in a style which recommended itself to the privileged classes: the great reading public which could thoroughly appreciate his powers had not yet come into being, and in the works of Dickens alone do we find that healthy naturalism which was destined to appeal to the masses of men and to make itself felt in genuine sympathy and the broadening of humane effort.

In fact, this was one of the most dreadful periods of history. The laboring population toiled under conditions impossible of description, the unrestrained operation of the machine industry was making an *Inferno* out of what is at the best the purgatory of the life of the laborer, even women and little children were feeling the worst effects of the tyranny of circumstances and the greed for gain. In spite of the growth of the new industry, the landholders still controlled legislation and oppressed the



masses by the imposition of heavy duties upon the staple commodities, so that the bulk of the population sprawled helpless between the upper and nether millstones of industrialism and landlordism.

From this chaos sprang almost at once a new creation—the corn laws were abolished, British Free Trade was established, schools were founded, and the worst phases of the bondage of the factory were eliminated.

If we seek economic and material reasons for these changes they are not hard to discover, for the balance of wealth had shifted from the soil to the factory, and the factory, or rather the system of which the factory is the outward symbol, requires active and energetic individual effort, while the soil demanded merely passive obedience and patient toil.

But the revolt, though in its political aspect, the revolt of a class, was in its moral aspect the revolt of sentiment, and with the sentimentalists, at all events, the first fruits of victory rested. It was sentiment and that the highest and the finest which caused the first investigations to be made into the conditions of the laboring classes and religious sentiment, of an, up to that time, almost unheard of type, which sent the priests of the Church of England, awakened to a sense of duty by the Tractarian movement, into the slums of the great cities, and set them grappling with the monsters which they discovered there. Sentiment, too, it was, which caused Maurice and Kingsley to espouse the cause of the downtrodden, and sentiment which sent the New England missionaries from village to village to preach the liberation of the chattel-slave.

But, however, much the world owes to the sentimental enthusiasm of the church and the philanthropists during the transition period, it is no less indebted to the artists of that time, and to one group of artists in particular.

In 1848 Dante Gabriel Rossetti, entered the studio of Madox Brown, from which time a rejuvenescence of art may be dated, a new birth of independence and of individuality, and the beginning of a tendency which was far other than the youthful Pre-Raphaelites had in mind. The value of this movement lay in the fact that it was a *movement*, that it was a revolt, a new departure, a flinging to the winds of the traditions of centuries, and a call to a new mission, and new work for the artist. The school failed in itself, was smothered in its own details and subtleties, but what does not art on both sides of the Atlantic owe to its impulse?

But it was the motto rather than the actual accomplishments of the Pre-Raphaelites which inspired so many struggling artists and lifted the yoke of oppressive authority from their shoulders.

The school demanded and insisted upon a return to nature. That Brown and the others misunderstood the meaning of the expression and thought that the real return to nature lay in a slavishly imitative copying of detail, does not affect the value of their proclamation, which must still remain the watchword of all true artists, and a perpetual incentive.

The Pre-Raphaelites, however, did not appeal to the populace for the idea of popularity was repugnant to the members of the school, who were artists in the most exclusive sense of the term. Their acknowledged adherents were few in number; in more than one sense they constituted a narrow clique and their artistic fortunes, are a matter of interest to specialists and historians, rather than to the general reader. The pioneers of revolutions always suffer from the same defects of temperament. They are doctrinaires, narrow, fanatic, and dogmatic beyond measure, with an absolute faith in the complete soundness of their position, and a no less absolute contempt for any ideas which may clash with their own. Hence, they in themselves accomplish apparently but little, still, insensibly to themselves they break the inertia of conventional submission and set in motion a mass the direction of which will be probably quite other than that intended by the movers.

And so the Pre-Raphaelites with all their zeal for a return to nature persisted in not returning. The school found its impulse in medieval life and it never could dissociate itself from its origin, for it was not of its time, and could never appeal to living men and women of the nineteenth century. High ideals and good work cannot of themselves gain recognition for their possessors, comprehensibility is essential, and it was just in comprehensibility that the Pre-Raphaelites were lacking. Idealization and the power of handling detailed work were theirs in a very marked degree, but they failed utterly to understand human needs and for this reason were ignored by ordinary men and women.

This was a matter of small concern to the Pre-Raphaelites, and so to the development of art, for the artists now having become fairly imbued with the spirit of revolt, and breaking away, more and more, from tradition, launched into all descriptions of experiment so that the later art development has been in the direction of greater and greater individuality, until peculiarity of style has become almost a necessary prerequisite of success and popularity.

It has hence come about that idealism has ebbed away from the conceptions of art, and that technical considerations have become more and more the main tests of excellence and real power. Art is now considered apart from any moral import, it is no longer a matter of ethics, but purely of esthetics. Thus by

a curious meeting of extremes we find art threatened with sterilization and that for reasons just the opposite of those which confronted it when the Pre-Raphaelites made their fight. At that time a weight of authority crushed it into the ground and prevented the full expression of individuality, to-day, freedom of expression has smothered true individuality and is causing an increasing glorification of technique.

In one direction, that of decorative art, the work of the Pre-Raphaelites has not been without effect, and that not consciously but by a sort of indirection. The efforts of William Morris towards the rehabilitation of beauty in matters of ordinary every day life, the common tools of ordinary toil, the common implements of ordinary use, the books which we handle, the walls on which we have to look, and the furniture which we need for our ordinary comfort, have undoubtedly accomplished much, and these efforts owe their inception to the movement in the direction of revolt which took the cry of a return to Nature as its watchword. But even this movement has been largely vitiated by conscious quackery, and its comparative failure as an effort to incorporate the esthetic instinct in the visible works of the hands of our civilized workmen, is evident from the fact that there is no successor to Morris worthy of the name.

Still, perhaps, in what is known as the Arts and Crafts movement may be found the germs of a more representative art than we have yet enjoyed in these latter years, and at all events there can be little doubt that the efforts of the great English craftsman and his coworkers have contributed not a little to the general dissemination of esthetic education, which must necessarily, in the course of time, produce some more worthy results.

*Austin Lewis.*



### The Three Crises of Marxism.

---



WHEN on the 14th of March, 1883, Karl Marx closed his eyes forever, Marxism had made decided progress, but it was still far from completely dominating International Socialism. A few years before Marxism, that is the theoretical and practical influence of the Marxian teaching had gone through its second crisis. The first came as a result of the International Revolution of 1848.

Here also the time of growth was followed by a time of crisis after recovering from which new ground was continuously won.

During the 40's there came a period of rapid advance in socialist thought and in the independence of the laboring class in Western Europe. Just as rapidly grew also the influence of Marx and Engels upon the most advanced portion of the proletariat. The International Band of the Communists stood firmly on its own feet in 1847 and issued the Communist Manifesto as its party program. In 1848 when the revolution broke out Marx was the editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, the main organ of the German revolutionists. The June Massacres brought this progress to an end. The counter revolution was victorious, and just as the advance of the revolutionary movement had specially favored Marxism so the downfall of the revolution struck it a heavy blow. It lost not simply its organ of publicity in Germany, its organization was not alone killed by police and courts, but democracy itself turned against it and rendered it systematically voiceless in Germany as well as in exile. Contemptuously Marx turned his back upon the quarrel of the emigrants and gathered together new weapons for the new impulse of the socialist movement of which in the darkest days of the reaction he was never for one moment doubtful.

And this new impulse came at the beginning of the 60's and therewith began the second period of the advance of Marxism. More extensive and powerful than before the revolution it moved everywhere in the labor movement and sought for objects and means with which to carry on the work of clarification and organization. Marx gave it both. He had not founded the International, it was in no way the work of any individual, but he did bring together for a single purpose the divergent forces that poured into it and thereby supplied strength to the International proletarian movement, which, without him, it could never have attained. A few years after the founding of the International he gave to humanity the deepest insight that had yet been attained into the economics of industry of the present society through the

publication of "Capital." The years from 1864 to 1870 were years of triumph for Marxism, it advanced from victory to victory and ever more and more won the joyful confidence of the laboring classes, but also the furious enmity of the ruling classes.

Then came the rise and fall of the Paris Commune, which formed the turning point in the "International" as the June massacres had done for the democracy of 1848. It released the rage of the ruling classes against the dreaded organization and its leaders. And the organization replied to the doubled and trebled rage of its attack, not with a closing up of its ranks, but with a division and fratricidal war which was much more injurious and destructive than the dissensions among the democratic emigrants of 1849.

As we have already seen Marx had with the greatest skill and tolerance brought together the divergent elements in the "International." Proudhonists and Blanquists of the Romance countries, English pure and simple unionists, and German Social democrats—but the maintenance of this combination became ever more difficult. The last congress of the "International" previous to 1870 had already shown great antagonisms particularly in regard to the agrarian question, where the small bourgeois Proudhonists with their respect for the landed interests and the private property stood opposed to those who defended in all possible ways modern technic and modern scientific agriculture, and common property in land. Continuous progress from victory to victory had not sufficed to hold these antagonistic elements together. The difficulties following the defeat set free the mutual reproaches and enmities of all the manifold non-Marxist elements.

It was Bakunin who gathered them together; to be sure not like Marx in a positive united activity, but only in order to cut all bonds, which had previously united them. It was given to Bakunin to destroy the Marxist International, but it was not given to him to put another in its place. After the Congress at The Hague in 1872 it fell to pieces.

Marxism was now in its second period of depression. In France all movement of the laborers was destroyed, anarchy reigned in the other romance countries, the English unions turned willingly to the bourgeois parties, and in Germany the Lassallians and Eisenachers were still fighting.

In Austria the movement had sunk from a beautiful blazing straw fire to a handful of ashes, in which a few sparks still dimly glimmered. And that greatest work of his life from which Marx had expected the revolutionizing of thought, "Capital" remained unnoticed.

So it was that the first half of the 70's was filled with dis-

appointment for Marx and Marxism, just as the second half of the 60's had been fruitful of favorable results.

The turn towards a new upward movement came this time not from France, or England, but from Germany. The German Social Democracy remained untouched by the otherwise universal retrogression of the independent labor movement, which the downfall of the Commune and the destruction of the International carried with it. In 1874 the German Social Democracy won a striking electoral victory, which brought about the era of results in Prussia, among which was the conclusion of the fratricidal strife, which had hitherto existed. From then on the growth of our party was almost continuous, being only transiently interrupted by the anti-socialist laws.

Soon after Marxism began to move in France, and anarchy and the pure and simple unionism to decrease. In 1876 "Egalité" was founded, edited by Jules Guesde, in co-operation with Lafargue, Deville and others, and in 1879 at the Congress of Marseilles the Marxian Labor Party was founded.

In Belgium, also, the laborers began to move in the second half of the 70's and stood practically, if not theoretically, upon the same ground as the German Social Democracy. The Socialist Party of Belgium, founded in 1879, is a party of the class struggle striving for the conquest of political power in order to free the laboring classes, and this is the distinguishing characteristic of practical Marxism.

At the same time the labor movement of Holland awoke out of the torpidity, into which it had fallen after the Congress at The Hague, and the Social Democratic Union in Amsterdam adopted the program of the German Social Democracy.

In Denmark, also, the end of the 70's saw a significant growth of Social Democracy.

Marx also lived to see the awakening of a Marxian Socialism in England, as well as (what was especially gratifying to him) the glorious heroic battle, which was led by the Russian revolutionists at the beginning of the 80's against absolutism. He followed this with enthusiasm and supported it wherever he could by advice and assistance with his personal connection.

The re-awakening of the Social Democratic and revolutionary movement and Marx's influence upon it broke at length the professorial conspiracy of silence. People began to criticise Capital and to "scientifically refute it." It needed nothing more than to be recognized in order to affect intellectual life. Its influence since then has grown in exactly the same degree that it has been "disproved."

At the time of Marx's death it was still impossible to say that his views and the tactics founded upon them dominated the In-

ternational labor movement. The romance countries especially were strongly tinctured with Bakuninism and Proudhonism, and just at the time of Marx's death a sort of Bakuninism had gained a hold in Austria.

Even narrower than the sphere of practical Marxism was at that time its theoretical influence. Even in Germany where Marx's theories were better understood than anywhere else there were still many traces of the ideas of Duhring, Rodbertus, Albert Lange, to say nothing of the remnants of the old "forty-eighters" like Jehann Jacoby and Rittinghausen.

When in 1877 the German Social Democracy founded a scientific periodical the "Zukunft" it did not stand upon Marxian basis, but on the contrary developed a directly anti-Marxian program without any voice being raised loudly in protest. The other scientific publication of socialism, which appeared in the German language at the time (the "Neue Gesellschaft" in Zurich) really had no program.

Almost at a single stroke all this was changed. Scarcely a decade had passed away before Marxism had conquered almost the whole socialist world, as was clearly shown by the International Congress of 1893. The ovation, which was extended to Frederick Engels at that time, was not simply to the personality of the veteran, it was equally to the teachings whose foundations he had helped to lay. Marxism had won not only the whole Slavic socialism, but had practically overcome anarchism in the romance world. It had even attained an influence in the English unions in the form of the new unionism.

It was not simply practical Marxism that had attained so dominating a position, but equally the theoretic. The multiplicity of socialist theories disappeared and only one remained of any significance, that of Karl Marx. The Theoreticians, who at the beginning of the 80's, still influenced wide circles of the laboring class and of the socialist intellectuals, such as Proudhon, Rodbertus, Durhing, Lange, Henry George and Schaffle, had lost all significance for the labor movement and socialist thought. The one theory which still played a part in the social democracy of romance lands alongside of Marxism, the "integral" socialism of Malon was no original uniform theory, but only a vari-colored mixture of odds and ends from all possible systems, Proudhonism, Marxism, Positivism, Schaffleism, etc.

But this great extension of Marxism was so by bounds that it was impossible for it to be permanent. The influence of rapid growth of Socialist Marxism had rendered it something fashionable, which everyone must know or else be considered behind the times. But nothing could be better suited to become a fashionable philosophy than Marxism, which is at the same time so fundamen-



tal and practical that it is not possible to remain on the surface of things or to dodge the difficulty of deeper investigation into it by mystical and mystifying phrases. If one is to understand Marx he must have knowledge and a tireless impulse to dig deeper. At the first approach to Marx one always secures a superficial and vulgar understanding of him, but if he is to truly comprehend him and solve the contradictions which exist between superficiality and the substance of things, between the apparent and the actual fundamental relations it is necessary to continuously widen the circle of one's own knowledge and then to bring this newly won knowledge ever again to the study of Marxian writings.

In Marxism, as with every fundamental philosophy investigation is necessary. For this the fashionable man has neither time nor inclination. The few empty formulas to which the fashionable Marxist reduces Marxism only lead him into insolvable contradictions with reality. Hence it was no wonder that he blamed Marxism for this and began quickly to revise his views, not by digging deeper, but rather by attempting to overthrow the entire teachings. They never noticed that the idea that they criticised and revised at bottom was nothing more than the creation of their own earlier mind.

But even if the Marxian teachings had been shallower the desertions of the fashion-loving element could not have been avoided, for the essence of fashion is in continuous change. The fashionable person wishes to astonish, differentiate himself from the mass of mankind so that he only follows the latest fashion of the time, while the great body of people cling on to the out-grown fashion. Once that a fashion has become universal the time has come for the fashionable person to change. So it happened that many young people played the part of strong Marxists so long as they thereby differentiated themselves from their comrades, but once that this Marxism had lost the attraction of newness they recognized how old it really was and there awoke in them a necessity for its revision.

So there has lately come about a third crisis in Marxism in course of which we now are, but which has been already well-nigh conquered.

With satisfaction we can testify to-day on the 20th birthday of Marx that it finds Marxism in much better condition than has any of its predecessors. Above all we have the main fact that practical Marxism has been almost completely untouched. The earlier crises of Marxism were the results of great practical defects, they affected much more the practical than the theoretical movement. This latest crisis on the contrary arises in the very midst of the most complete triumphant course of practical Marx-

ism. It has no extraordinary occasion for existence unless we count as such the death of the second of the fathers of Marxism (Liebknecht).

One might, perhaps, refer to France and Italy as countries in which practical Marxism was in retreat. But the elements which have there broken loose from Marxism were only such ones as it had lately gained, and even there the defenders of solidarity of classes who are in the ranks of Socialist parties in those countries have not dared to make an open and decisive renunciation of the class struggle.

They do not oppose to the tactics of the class struggle any other decisive tactics, but satisfy themselves with pleading for freedom of thought and autonomy, with which beautiful words they designate the dissolution of all party discipline. However, we have in each of these countries a nucleus of the Marxian movement, whose strength and solidarity had been proven before 1893 and has not grown less since then.

Opposed to the relative retrogression in France and Italy are powerful advances in other places. The anarchistic crisis in Holland, which ten years ago was strong, is now completely overcome and practical Marxism grows and flourishes. In America finally a purely American social democracy exists, from which great results may be expected. In this same direction Russia must also be counted, where in 1893 the movement was greatly weakened. The young proletariat now moves powerfully forward in that country and that absolutely in the Marxian sense. Every step in the actual movement is, however, according to the well known words of Marx worth more than a hundred programs.

Meanwhile there is not a single place in which this latter crisis of Marxism has brought about any fundamental revision of our program, except in France, where the ministerial socialism places the socialist movement, as a product equally of the class struggle and the declaration of human rights of the French revolution, as antagonistic to liberalism, rather than the consequence of liberalism.

The theory upon which this peculiar program rests has not yet been stated. Above all this latest crisis of Marxism has brought forth no theory which can be opposed to Marxism. In spite of all criticisms and disfigurements to-day, as ten years ago, Marxism is the single, uniform, comprehensive theory of socialism. All the theories which were in full swing at the time of Marx's death are forgotten and no new one has yet appeared. The recently appearing attempt of David even is not a new theory of society, but only a new theory of one portion, agriculture, which he mechanically isolates and places in opposition to the totality of society. In industry David accepts Marxism; in agriculture he

is a sort of new Proudhonist. He himself claims to apply the Marxian method as he understands it. We shall have something further to say of this attempt, however, in another place.

As opposed to Marxism revisionism signifies neither a further development nor the substitution of another doctrine. It signifies nothing more or less than the rejection, not alone of the Marxian, but of every social theory; it stands in the same relation to Marxism as did the historical school of National economy to the classic economists.

As the Ricardian school dissolved it did not give way to a newer higher system of political economy, but to the historical school, which made a virtue of necessity and declared that all investigation into deeper economic relations was an empty speculation that could only be justified when the scientific facts of economics were insufficient. To-day the investigation of universal economic law is considered something out of date. The economic life is much too rich and manifold to be brought under universal laws. Not the universal, but the special, constitutes the content of modern economic science, not the investigation of laws, but the description of developments and results. The preliminary condition of science becomes with it the content of science itself.

To be sure something valuable can be accomplished in this manner for science, and the historical school is able to show some very significant results, especially in the field of economic history. It also must not be forgotten that even descriptive science, if it is to become anything more than a mere heaping-up of individual facts without purpose or aim, must proceed from definite theoretical principles, which lead them to choose from among the facts those which are typical and to group them. So, for example, statistics have given some very important results during the last decade, which make it possible for us to see many things much clearer than was possible for Ricardo and Marx with all their power of abstraction. But the first condition of useful statistics is a purposeful stating of a question, and this again presupposes a deep theoretical insight into the substance of the things to be investigated.

The historical school would not have been able to accomplish even that which it did if it had not (to be sure many times unconsciously) frequently made use in its investigations of the much despised abstractions of the great economic theoreticians. On the other side we must not forget that the classical economists as well as Marx, even if they did not have at their command all of the results of modern statistics had completely mastered what economic material in the way of facts existed in their time. This is easily overlooked because it was customary to con-

trast their method of presentation with their method of investigation. This distinction is to be sure already out of date. Our modern Ricardos and Marxian conquerors generally have the greatest anxiety to put every exception, every observation at once upon paper *urbi et orbi* to announce it, and then afterwards to think it over and decide what their great discovery actually signifies. The method of investigation and of presentation are so concealed that one can scarcely speak of method at all. Just as many a modern merchant keeps his entire stock in the show case so many a modern economist places all the facts at his disposal in his writings. That an abstract presentation can be based upon an immense mass of facts appears unthinkable to these representatives of modern science. An abstract presentation is, according to them, a presentation drawn from the fingers' ends, speculation in thin air.

Just as the historical school in spite of the fact that they indicate a theoretical retrogression toward Ricardo can easily enrich science by valuable individual investigations, so can the revisionists, even if they do indicate a theoretical retrogression in regard to Marx, still further the progressive development of social insight in so far as it is able to fulfill the demands of an individual scientific tendency and does not become a mere restoration of the worship of that vulgar sentimental socialisms, which in the 70's still dominated the whole socialist movement only to give way to Marxism and thereby to become exterminated until this last crisis of Marxism gave it courage to once more come into the light and to pose as a conqueror.

Revisionism can really bring scientifically valuable results to light if they become conscious of the bounds of their ability and like the historical school lay the emphasis upon the description of developments and results. So, for example, to instance only two: the Webbs, by their "History of English Trade Unionism," and Tugan Baranowsky, by his "History of the Russian Factory," have certainly produced significant scientific results and perceptibly widened our social view point.

Whenever revisionism dares to enter the theoretic field, whether it be critical, or an attempt at positive development, it is always shattered, because it is no new comprehensive and uniform theory, but only a single existing tendency in socialism and Marxism.

But if the revisionism is to be continuously distinguished from the historical school in order that it shall stand upon proletarian and not upon bourgeois ground, it is continually forced to enter the field of theory and therein lies one of its weakest sides. A rising class, which cannot come to its full justification and free development in the scope of the society in which it grows,



is forced as soon as it comes to a self-consciousness to set up in place of the existing social form another form corresponding to its interests. It cannot, however, do this without developing a theory of all society. The character of this theory depends upon the condition of the universal and of their particular knowledge. It can under certain conditions be very naive and yet fulfill its historical role. But it must always be compatible with the universally recognized scientific views and must comprehend the totality of society. So it was that the bourgeoisie when they had come to a self-consciousness and would form society, according to their interest were compelled to formulate a comprehensive social theory and they did this in the economy of the Physiocrats and in the school of Smith and Ricardo. This theoretical necessity disappeared as soon as they had attained to rulership and no more sought to change the whole of society, but rather sought to conserve this in order to improve it in certain special cases.

From this on the historical school was the corresponding expression of their scientific need. Its appearance was not an accident. Whatever was possible of continuance in the bourgeoisie can occur in the class condition of the proletariat, only under special local or temporary conditions. Such, for example, as existed in England during the last decade for the economically organized portion of the proletariat, or for period from 1896 to 1900 predominated in the proletariat of the whole world. The proletariat cannot obtain that social freedom and equality, which it demands in the present society. It must also as a rule stand in a condition of enmity to the ruling society and must, accordingly aim to transform the whole society; that is to say it must be revolutionary. The proletariat, accordingly, demands a uniform, comprehensive theory of the whole of society upon which it can base its efforts for the transformation of the whole of society.

So long as the classic bourgeois economy dominated, the proletariat could accept this social theory in so far as it corresponded to its needs. To-day it is only the scientific socialism, that is, a theory of society proceeding from the proletarian standpoint and based upon scientific investigation of society, which the revolutionary proletariat needs.

The theoretical necessity, which has died out in the bourgeoisie since it became conservative, is in the proletariat by the very condition of its class continuously renewed. It cannot continuously satisfy itself, therefore, with a mere translation of the historical school into proletarian phraseology as the revisionists seek to do. On the other hand, this manner of thought of the historical school drawn from the conservative attitudes of its representatives (the word conservative is used in the social, not

the political, sense) leads to a denial of every comprehensive renovation of society and a division of interests into individual reforms and individual effort. So it is that revisionism if it develops to become of any consequence, that is, if it is to remain capable of any action whatever will be brought in conflict with the revolutionary socialist movement. But it will also, if it is to remain true to socialism, be continuously compelled to turn to the great question of social theory and so to come back again and again, whether it will or not, to the boundary line of Marxism, if it is not to become confused with bourgeois liberalism. For, as we have already said, it cannot find another theory of scientific socialism.

Whoever believes that he can set forth a higher theory may do it—but this is only possible to a giant intellect. It was one of the greatest acts of the human mind when socialism was brought forth.

Up to the present time there is not even an embryo of this giant intellect visible. But the views and contributions of the historical school are incapable of either revising, developing or rooting out Marxism. It is not so simple as that. Revisionism can just as little destroy Marxism theoretically, as opportunism can destroy it practically. It has made an end, however, of the fashionable Marxism; over that, however, we will shed no tears. The vital strength of the conquering and advancing Marxism, accordingly has been guarded through its third crisis as gloriously as in both the first.

To-day, twenty years after the death of our great master, the light that he has shed upon the essence of human, and especially of bourgeois society, shows itself more than ever as a guiding star, which we follow as showing to us the least painful way to the great final goal, the emancipation of the proletariat and therewith the redemption of mankind from the curse of capitalism.

*Translated from the Neue Zeit by A. M. Simons.*

### Notes from Australia.

---



ALTHOUGH Australia is yet a long way behind the older countries in industrial development the same problems which are pressing for solution elsewhere are to be met with here. At present the Unemployed question is causing wide-spread anxiety among the working-classes. An idea of the position may be gathered from the utterance of a speaker at a meeting of unemployed in Melbourne recently. He said: "They would have another Trafalgar Square in Melbourne just to show that they were not going to die of starvation. Men who were drawing £900 a year could not feel for the unemployed; they looked upon men out of work as belonging to an inferior class. . . . What were the workers to do—lie down and rot? They would be fools if they did. It would be better to die fighting than starving."

The existence of the unemployed is simply ignored by the State Parliaments, which are merely committees run in the interests of the capitalists and which devote themselves to making concessions to the pastoralists, to mining syndicates, or to other private enterprises.

The Pastoralists, however, have endeavored to turn the present crisis to their own advantage by attempting to entrap the bush workers into a bogus union, called The Machine Shearers' Union. The real object of this new union is to exterminate the Australian Workers' Union. The A. W. U. entered a protest against the registration of this new union in New South Wales, but the Machine Shearers' Union with only a mere handful of members was able to face an expensive law case and has been registered. The fundamental principle of this union, says its secretary, is that it is not now nor at any time going to be a political organization. It must be kept strictly non-political. It is now making vigorous efforts to extend its sphere of action beyond New South Wales, but there is no serious danger of this union spreading among the bush workers, as they are the backbone of the Political Labor Movement.

At a recent conference of unions a scheme has been suggested for the federation of all the unions in Australia. It is too early to say what will come of this proposal, but it must be welcomed as a sign that the workers in the various states recognize the identity of the interests of labor wherever it is. It is to be lamented, however, that the majority of the unionists in Australia are more interested in gaining a few extra shillings a week than in trying to alter their economic position. In the capitals of each of

the states are socialist organizations, whose immediate duty is to convert the unions to socialism. Recently Tom Mann has been appointed organizer for the Victorian unions. In a pamphlet entitled, *The Labor Movement of Both Hemispheres*, recently written by him, he says: "There is no cure for this pitiable state of affairs short of public ownership of mine and minerals, public ownership of land and machinery and public control of industry in the interests of all alike."

*Andrew M. Anderson.*



## The Rural Exodus.\*



ALL over the world Socialists are studying the problem of the farmer. No one has done more exhaustive work in this field than Emile Vandervelde. This monograph on a single phase of the subject is filled with extremely valuable material.

He begins by showing that the rural exodus has been an invariable accompaniment of capitalism. Statistics are given for all the principal European and American cities, showing everywhere a continuous movement from the country toward the city. In some countries this movement is so rapid that there is a positive decrease of population in the country districts, but in most countries there is simply a more rapid growth of the urban population.

Agricultural laborers are growing constantly fewer in all countries where capitalism is established. "Even in the United States, where the total agricultural population is increasing, the number of agricultural workers tends to diminish." In 1880 there were 3,323,870 agricultural laborers in the United States, and in 1890 this number had decreased over 300,000. In Germany and in France there is a similar movement, while in England it has proceeded much further than in any other country.

In the second chapter he considers the causes of the rural exodus and mentions three factors: First, the attraction of the cities; second, the ease of transport; third, over-population of the country. None of these are very definite and the classification offers considerable ground for criticism. The first two he at once admits are insufficient to account for any great movement, and are really but superficial names for deeper forces. "The thing which renders the exodus absolutely necessary is the relative over-population of the country, making it impossible to find means of existence and compelling the rural dwellers to search for the means of living in other places."

Nothing is more characteristic of the farmer than the obstinacy with which he clings to the corner of earth upon which he has always lived, and when such a great portion of the rural population move towards the city it indicates a powerful compelling force. Another reason which is of greater importance in Europe than in America, although not wholly lacking in some parts of this country, especially in New England, is the division of the common land. A fundamental

\**L'Exode Rural et le Retour aux Champs*, by Emile Vandervelde; Felix Alcan, Paris. Publisher. Cloth, 304 pp., 8 francs.

cause of the rural exodus is found in the separation of industry from agriculture. Weaving, iron working, and the linen industry are a few of those which were formerly performed by the tillers of the soil, but which have now moved to the great industrial centers. Another cause on which he lays considerable importance is the agricultural crisis which was brought about in Europe between 1846 and 1875 by the fall in the price of grain due to American and Russian competition. The extensive introduction of machinery in agriculture and the use of pasturage instead of cultivated land has made a large number of laborers unnecessary. The seasonal character of agriculture renders labor uncertain and adds another cause. In this chapter, although he mentions as noted above the moving of many industries from the country, he does not seem to give anywhere near the importance which is due to the fact that a continuously increasing number of industries, which originated on the farm, are moving toward the city. Such for example have been the killing and preparation of meat and the preparation of dairy products.

The third chapter on the "Forms of the Rural Exodus" is one of the most exhaustive and valuable portions of the book. He points out that this may be divided into the permanent and seasonal emigration and studies at great length the various phases of these three movements. He shows the effect of the daily exodus on city wages, the part played by low railroad fares, and the inhumanly long hours the daily journey of many miles entails upon these workers.

The fourth chapter discusses the consequence of the rural exodus. The subject is viewed from the point of view of the workers, and he concludes that in spite of the fact of the long hours and many disadvantages under which the rural laborer works, he nevertheless improves his condition when he comes to the city. He is brought in touch with a wider world and is given a broader outlook and as a general thing receives a higher wage than was paid upon the farm. The farmers consider this movement of the workers as decidedly to their disadvantage, as it brings a new competitor into the market for the purchase of labor power and as a consequence they generally oppose the "workman's trains" and the whole movement away from the country. From the point of view of the collectivity he finds that the Socialists at least have every reason to look with favor upon this movement.

The men who are brought in from the country become messengers of Socialism to their own neighborhoods. They become permeated with a class consciousness and afford the best means of reaching an otherwise almost inaccessible section of population. Everywhere physically and morally he considers that there is not near as much to be said against the movement to the city as is

commonly supposed at the present time. It is undoubtedly true as he points out that the conditions of housing and general living of the city proletariat is much more unsatisfactory than it might be in the country, yet this is something capable of alteration and scarce outweighs the other advantages.

The second part of the book is entitled "The Return to the Fields," and covers a subject which has hitherto been much neglected. "The one essential characteristic of modern times and particularly of the nineteenth century, is centralization; political centralization through the formation of the bourgeois state and the establishment of nationalities; economic centralization through the concentration of capital and labor power; finally, as a necessary consequence of these, urban centralization, through the multiplication of great cities, the centers of industry and government." Nevertheless "Counter currents are manifest in the opinion of many thinkers as well as in the practice of business men."

The central portion of many cities shows a decrease in population; business blocks and office buildings driving the former dwellers toward the outskirts. He finds that the great increase in population which many of the cities show, arises from the settling up of the suburban portion often by people who are moving from the city itself. "Naturally a movement of this sort increases as the means of transport are improved. . . . In short, after having been one of the principal causes of the desertion of the country by disassociating industry from agriculture, by giving rise to the agricultural crisis and rendering the rural exodus more easy, the development of means of communication and transport have now produced a contrary effect by favoring the industrialization of agriculture, the creation of industrial establishments in the country, and the temporary or complete exodus of city dwellers to the open country."

The industrialization of agriculture shows itself in the organization of the milk trade and the handling of vegetables which were formerly brought in by the growers themselves, but which now require great commercial and industrial organizations for their handling. It is remarkable that the author who is ordinarily so familiar with American conditions did not note the fact that this movement had developed much further in the United States than in any of the countries he describes. This is especially remarkable in view of the fact that information on this point is so easily accessible, it having been worked out and summarized by the Industrial Commission.

Market gardening is another instance of the industrialization of agriculture which is tending to create a population midway between city and country life. Such industries located close to the

cities avoid many of the difficulties of the labor supply which affects agriculture proper. In this connection it is noteworthy that many manufacturing firms have moved into suburban locations partially to avoid trades unions and the high rent of urban locations. The utilization of electricity will probably extend this movement. We are inclined to think, however, that Vandervelde exaggerates this point, and the illustrations that he draws from the United States are by no means wholly reliable. He concludes that "On the whole there are serious reasons for thinking that we have arrived at a turning point in industrial evolution from the point of view of geographical distribution of undertakings."

Considerable time is devoted to the various phases of this movement towards the country, and also to the discussion of various plans for the building of villages having the advantages of both city and country. He recognizes, however, that no rational distribution of the population is possible so long as capitalism remains and profit is the social motive force.

*A. M. Simons.*



## Discharged.

---



NOT charged with crime—no, no!  
Not charged with guilt in e'en a slight degree—no, no!  
Not charged with gross incompetence or carelessness or  
shirking toil or answering back when he was or-  
dered here and there—

No, no!

Discharged. That's all.

I stood and watched my Brother when that fateful word was flung  
at him.

I saw the pallor of his poorly nourished skin and flesh fade to the  
likeness of a corpse.

I looked to see him smite the sender of that damned, death-deal-  
ing word who'd lived and thrived and piled up wealth (and  
squandered it like dirt) through all the fruitful fat and gra-  
cious years, from toil of his,—full in the face, and then de-  
mand his share.

I looked to see my Brothers, Comrades, Friends, arise and rally  
to his side and keep that crushing word from casting its  
blood-curdling terror through the heart of wife and child he  
loves.

I looked to see the brutal thief that banished him from bread,  
that had betrayed him into useless, needless toil, that had de-  
prived him of a chance to be what Brothers all should be, in  
haste retreat to land where kings have guilt-trapped slave;  
trained to destroy who doubts the right of man to steal—*so he  
steals legally, or bribes the judge.*

I looked, and looked!

I looked in vain.

As meekly as a snake-charmed dove submits, and far more unre-  
sistingly than sheep yield to the butcher's hand, he turned  
aside—and hid his tears, and gulped his hot resentment down.

I followed far behind and bared my head when he had entered  
home of his and theirs and faced the fear and terror his en-  
slaver ne'er had dared to face.

I heard the awful cry from woman's love-kissed lips—

"NOT OUT OF WORK! GREAT GOD, WHAT SHALL  
WE DO."

No work had I for these skilled hands—else had I shared with  
him.

But I have given this:—

I have confronted his enslaver with the cry of THIEF.

I have tapped lightly and with love upon my Comrade's door  
and entering clasped his hand and spoken words to him—and  
I have seen answering light leap in his eyes that made his  
wife and children smile.

And I have broken bread with him and tasted salt while leaning  
far across his sparse-laid board, while I was sending courage  
to his heart and speaking words of Peace, God's peace: *as-*  
*serting Right's uprising, instant, swift, and stern:* to his re-  
ceptive brain—and all the while his wife and children smiles,  
for hope of Freedom's dawn.

\* \* \* \* \*

*Rejoice, O Wife, your husband will not let you starve while kings  
have plenty and while queens toil not!*

*Rejoice, O Children, for your father kind and just will never let  
you want while rich retain one penny he has earned!*

*Rejoice, O Men! A slave was slain with words this day!*

*Rejoice, O Earth! Your child was born anew this day—  
Behold, he is a MAN!*

\* \* \* \* \*

“Discharged!”

Now may the Power that made this earth and man demand of  
you, O sleek enslaver of my Brother's wife and child (I say  
naught of himself: he is a man and should bear no man's  
word “Discharged”) by what right, warrant or permission  
you have uttered such a word to man!

Sure, there are some that dare denounce that word as but a mur-  
derer's cudgel dashing more than flesh and blood and life to  
earth, and wielded by a coward through another's hand.

“But words are wind,” my murderer sneers, “and who indeed  
are they that hurl such words at me?”

But words are wind, and wind is breath, and breath is life; and  
Poet's words are vital words for slaves, and death-charged  
words that win their way to the enslaver's ear, demanding in  
the name of Power above, of Power that still abides in slaves,  
of Power that stirs at sight of quivering lips of worker's  
wives and tears in their loved children's eyes, demanding  
and demanding and *demanding*, by what thieved warrant,  
right, permission, you, *a man*, while wealth was in your hand,  
have dared to say

DISCHARGED.

*Edwin A. Brenholts.*

## Tolstoi and Socialism.

---

**I**N the St. Louis Republic of Nov. 30th was an article, copyrighted by W. R. Hearst, under the title of "A Return to Nature," by Count Leo Tolstoi, in which the great Russian author appears as an enemy of Socialism.

It is hard to believe that an article so full of self-evident contradictions and so deficient in logical conclusions could have come from this great writer's pen.

The article starts well with the following:

"The fact that you workingmen are forced to pass your life in poverty, not to say misery; that you are condemned to the hardest kind of work that does not benefit, while other people who do not work at all reap the profits of your work—the fact that many of you are practically slaves of these people, and the fact that this is unjust, must be clear to anyone who has a heart and eyes to see with. But what is to be done to change this?"

He then advocates what he calls a return to nature, where every man becomes attached to the soil and individually or as a family produces everything he needs.

This is a condition of primitive barbarism which no one questions his right to advocate, but in the following references to Socialism he shows a surprising ignorance of the simplest conditions of Socialism.

I quote at length: "When all men have been deprived of the ground they possess, when they shall have become factory hands . . . then the time will come when they shall own in full all the lands and all the factories. One would think that a doctrine like this (Socialism) that asks the workingman, living and working in free, open air, occupied in good healthy farming work, to give up his free wholesome life close to nature's bosom and move into the noise and impure atmosphere of the city, to work like a machine at monotonous work in a factory, and to live in filthy, squalid tenement lodgings that will drive the color out of the cheeks of his children, would not have much chance of success among thoughtful men who, working their natural soil, are not used to being slaves, as the workers in a modern factory practically are. And still this doctrine which is called Socialism is gaining rapidly even in a country like Russia, where 98 per cent of the workingmen are still occupied at farm work."

In the first statement he assumes that the people are deprived of the ground they possess and then become full owners

of all the land as well as all the factories. Then, if the people become full owners of the land, what right has he to assume that they will be asked to give it up and move into impure cities, monotonous factories and filthy and squalid tenements, as he pictures in the following sentence? What right has he to assume that when the people own and operate the factories they will be as he pictures? If the people own them will they not transform them so that they can enjoy them and eliminate all the disagreeable features? He conceives of an entire change in society, its usages and customs, yet he leaves the cities and factories unchanged. He removes the sewer that befouls the stream, but cannot see that the stream is changed. How can he conceive of the cities filled with noisome factories and filthy and squalid tenements when the capitalist owners have been eliminated from our industrial activities and the people own their own homes?

He says further: "Land is all that is worth fighting for, all that is necessary to enable a man to make a living; and still the Socialist leaders say nothing about the land, or at least its importance is placed second to that of owning the factories. . . . The laboring masses must demand the land that is now owned by the few, they must demand it of their governments, not as a favor, but as a right, for the reason that all land should belong to those who will work it—and not to a class of useless drones."

Is it possible that Leo Tolstoi can be so ignorant of Socialism as not to know that the common ownership of land is the first and fundamental proposition of Socialism? Whether or not agriculture and its affiliated industries would be carried on collectively under Socialism or the use of the land given to individuals under a lease of use, no Socialist questions the necessity of the collective ownership of all lands. It would seem that the great Russian has formed a perverted conception of Socialism or the capitalistic press of this country has put false words upon his pen.

*W. L. Garver.*

Chillicothe, Mo.



# EDITORIAL

## Our Real Antagonist.

It has been quite the fashion among Socialists to hold out W. R. Hearst as the "bogey man" who was sure to get us if we didn't watch out. The great and overwhelming danger of the Socialist party was held to consist in the possibility of "sidetracking" the Socialist movement by the growth of the Hearst and Bryan Democracy. We plead guilty of having shared in this fear for some time, but we are now firmly convinced that the heavy Socialist artillery turned in that direction wasted a lot of ammunition that was greatly needed at other points. The radical democracy is really something that has had its day. It has become comparatively helpless, hopeless and harmless. In this respect it is but a reflection of the economic class of which it is composed. The small bourgeois have always been a weak, vacillating class. This class by the very fact of the conflicting interests which arise from the divergent interests of its members, and the constantly changing makeup of its personality has never been able to play any important part in history for any great length of time.

Hearst has endeavored to hitch its fortunes to the chariot of Labor by his famous editorial on "Democracy, Labor's Natural Ally," but it appeared too late to be of any avail. Had this editorial been written immediately after the Presidential election of 1900 and had he been supported in this position by Bryan and the Populist wing of the party in an active campaign for the enactment of reform legislation it is quite probable that this movement would have reached sufficient proportions to have been of great importance. Had a fortunate panic come along it might even have landed one of its leaders in the Presidential chair, and effectively blanketed the sails of the Socialist ship for some years to come. But to have supposed such a thing is to grant to the small capitalist class a social insight and a political initiative which is absolutely foreign to its nature. Now that it has moved it is weak and uncertain, torn by conflicting interests and incapable of any decisive action.

The small capitalists of the North, being largely made up from the trading class, since the ousting of the small manufacturers by the trusts, are beginning to feel themselves dependent upon the increased purchasing power of the workers and so are quite ready to fall in with Hearst's support of "trade unions" and national ownership of railroads. They hope to use the trade unions both in the economic and

political field as a means of smashing the trusts and thus re-establish the little exploiter upon the backs of the workers.

In the South the small capitalist class is largely composed of those who are just beginning to establish manufactories and is hostile to all forms of labor legislation or labor organization. It is worthy of note that neither of the Hearst papers nor Bryan's "Commoner" have dared to take any very open stand on the question of child labor.

But the movement, such as it is, is already disintegrated. It is an open secret that the Cleveland-Olney wing are in control of the political machinery of the Democratic party. This is as the great capitalists would have it. With Cleveland or some one of similar political views nominated in opposition to Roosevelt we should have a practical coalition of the forces of plutocracy against the rising Socialist movement, and this is what appearances indicate that we shall see.

Hence it is that we believe that the real danger to proletarian advance and the real opponent of the Socialist party must be sought elsewhere, even for the present moment, than in the ranks of radical democracy. The opponents of Socialism have but two ways to fight it: open hostility and secret bribery. The radical democracy can offer nothing in the way of bribes, and open hostility on its part would be simply laughable.

In the Hanna movement within the Republican party, however, we have all the elements from which may be developed a Bismarckian policy in America that shall have infinitely greater strength than Bismarck was able to command. It will be stronger and more clever if allowed to develop than its German prototype, because of the fact that it will apparently originate and remain in close connection with the labor organizations themselves. The Civic Federation offers a most effective means of hoodwinking the workers into believing that they are securing advantages through their own exertions; always a much more gratifying point of view than to think that these slight advantages are granted as favors from some benevolent despot. Mark Hanna, or some similar statesman, can pose as the friend of labor and apparently assist them in making trifling gains. He can cajole the labor fakir and deceive the ignorant labor leader much more successfully than Hearst since the latter can offer only words while Hanna can occasionally produce real though small results. He can offer political plums to those whose fakirdom has become too evident or who are particularly favored as stool pigeons. Examples of this will occur to everyone in the recent appointments of Madden, Arthur, Clarke, et al. The Republican party is in power. It is the organ of the real social and economic rulers of America. These rulers can therefore actually grant a slight amelioration which the Democratic party can only promise. Meanwhile Roosevelt can pose as a strenuous enemy of the trust and catch those who are still foolish enough to believe in trust-smashing.

In this connection the public press seems to have forgotten all about the great results that were to follow the Northern Securities decision. When this decision was announced all the newspapers proclaimed that it was the deathblow of the trust, but up to the present time we have not heard that even the particular company against

which it was aimed has been affected and indeed we will venture to say that the only way that any of them have been touched is the way in which politicians usually touch the great capitalists, i. e., for larger contributions to the campaign fund.

Incidentally it is worth while to call attention to a fact in this connection which seems to have escaped the Socialist press. The lawyer who assisted Attorney General Knox in the Northern Securities case, the moment the decision was made, took a position with a firm of lawyers in New York City which handles most of J. P. Morgan's business.

But to return. In our opinion, a truthful forecast of political events would run something as follows: The rapid disintegration of the Bryan Democracy and the drifting of a considerable portion of its membership into the Socialist party, the practical coalition of the Republican and Democratic party by the nomination of candidates standing for the same principles in opposition to the Socialist party. The Democratic candidate being a pure dummy, we would be little interested in him. The Republican party would hold out Hanna as the gloved hand with which to pet and saddle and mollify the laboring class while they were being led to the slaughter, and Roosevelt would pose as the mailed fist apparently preparing to deal death and destruction to the trusts, but really organizing a national guard and distributing riot bullets, Gatling guns and other paraphernalia for the slaughter of workmen should they not be sufficiently decimated by the Hanna policy.

---

This number of *The Review* ends our third volume. With our next number we shall greatly improve the typographical appearance and general character. The July number will contain several very important articles. Among these will be a reply by Mrs. May Wood Simons to the articles which appeared in the May number criticising the materialistic interpretation of history. There will also be a translation of an important article by Achille Loria on the same subject, and the editor will have an article on the economic aspects of chattel slavery in the United States, which will bring out many points on this question never previously published.

# THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

Some of those labor officials who have quoted Mr. Herman Justi approvingly for advising employers to organize, with the expectation that the bosses' associations would treat with the unions, are having their hopes partly fulfilled. That is, the capitalists are getting together rapidly enough—in fact, there is a veritable organization boom on among them—but as they begin to realize the power of their combinations they seem to grow more autocratic and are disinclined to conciliate and arbitrate. In New York, for example, a \$500,000,000 combine of employers has been formed, and its slogan is "The Walking Delegate Must Go!" In Omaha the whole town was torn up with strikes and lockouts, all due to the fact that the organized bosses refused to listen to arbitration. In Kansas City the bosses united and declared opposition to all concerns that discriminated against unorganized labor and non-union products. In Chicago they are organizing along the lines of trade unions. In Connecticut the building contractors combined and introduced a reference card and secret code, and insisted that all workers must carry such card. In Pittsburg the employers are uniting to run their own business and resist the tyranny of trade unions, etc.; and in scores of other places, large and small, the same thing is occurring. And still Hanna says Parryism does not represent the views and acts of American capitalists. But the wily Senator may have a few irons in the fire. The fact remains that the capitalists are combining, and it is only a question of time when the final struggle for mastery between the two classes will commence and be fought to a finish. That it will be political and economic no person of sound sense will attempt to deny at this late day. Far-seeing capitalists themselves admit it and are preparing. Labor must do like wise or lose.

The Canadian capitalists are not disguising the fact that they are organizing to destroy the unions. A powerful association of bosses has been formed in Toronto and branches are being started all over the Dominion. They have become so aggressive that a serious attempt is being made to sever the Canadian unions from those of the United States, and a bill is now being pushed in Parliament, which provides that any alien who urges men to strike in Canada may be imprisoned for two years. The bosses are also attempting to cripple the union label, while the Taff Vale method of confiscating union treasuries has been introduced, the woodworkers having been fined \$100 and costs for engaging in a strike in Berlin, Ont. The new Brotherhood of Railway Employers (which is modeled after the plan of the old A. R. U.



and includes all classes of railway workers) has been making such rapid headway on the other side of the line that the Canadian Pacific officials are reported to have announced that they will spend \$5,000,000 to crush the organization. All these incidents are tending to awaken the Canadian workingmen to the necessity of taking independent political action, and Socialism is making splendid gains.

An Indiana District Court has ruled that trade unions may be sued for damages caused by strike or boycott, probably taking the cue from the outcome of the case in Rutland, Vt., where the machinists were mulcted in the sum of \$2,500 damages. Several printing firms in Chicago quickly took the hint and sued the bookbinders for a total of \$35,000 damages, and in Adams, Mass., a butcher also wants unions that have boycotted him to pay for their acts. The Dayton damage cases are still in court, as are those in New York.

Another bitter jurisdiction fight in the labor world has been settled by the amalgamation of the two national sheet metal workers' unions in their joint conventions in Milwaukee. The struggle between these two bodies for mastery became so fierce that personal assaults took place in a number of cities, and the factions denounced and worked against each other everywhere. But now extreme hatred has given way to extreme enthusiasm, and the rank and file are awakened to a full understanding of the benefits of thorough unionism as against factional wars. The trouble between the carpenters' brotherhood and the amalgamated men culminated in a big strike in New York, where 10,000 members of the brotherhood struck against working with the "mals." The brotherhood has also made an agreement with cabinet manufacturers of New York, which means a widening of the breach between them and the woodworkers. The machinists, at their recent convention in Milwaukee, seem to have changed their policy and joined the "industrialists" by the adoption of a resolution claiming jurisdiction over all employes in a machine shop. This action will bring them into conflict with the allied metal mechanics, who claimed the right to organize helpers, laborers, etc. The long-pending controversy between the brewery workers and the engineers and firemen seems no nearer settlement. The molders have also spread out and effected an amalgamation with the coremakers and will organize the foundry laborers. The waiters have again decided to claim jurisdiction over sea cooks, waiters, etc., and the clash with the seamen will continue, and the longshoremen are steadily pushing ahead and absorbing all classes of workers along and upon waterways. The tailors are again voting upon the question of admitting special order workers and thus cutting into the garment workers. And the end is not yet.

A nice state of affairs, which thoroughly illustrates the viciousness of government by injunction, exists in California. The mill and smelter and mine workers of Keswick have been making a hard fight against the Mountain Copper Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Great Britain. The men were in a fair way of winning when the corporation enticed them back to work with the promise of arbitrating all differences. The men returned, but the

bosses deliberately broke their promises. Thereupon the workers struck a second time and the company imported scabs from wherever they could be found. However, the strikers were again securing the upper hand in the struggle, when the corporation played its trump card in the shape of an injunction from a Federal Court. So here we have a foreign corporation lording it over and bringing hardship and suffering to American citizens. Still the politicians talk about "America for Americans" and "Americanizing the unions!"

Hats off to the Hebrew printers of New York. They lead the procession. They have established themselves on a four-hour workday basis with wages at \$15 per week. This is the maximum labor time that the advocates of Socialism declare is necessary, but by no means the maximum wage rate, and there are a goodly number of believers in Socialistic doctrine among the New York Hebrew printers, and they are putting their theory into practice.

Mr. John Hobson, the well-known British economist, has been travelling through the country recently investigating the trust question, in which he is deeply interested, and delivering lectures in the principal cities. He has written several books dealing with labor questions, and enjoys the fullest confidence and respect of the unionists on the other side of the Atlantic. He is of the opinion that industrial affairs in America are rapidly reaching a crisis, and marvels at the immense power of the Rockefeller and Morgan capitalists who control wealth from raw material to finished product laid upon the market. He realizes that such a condition cannot endure and predicts that America will go to a Socialistic basis before any other country. "Organized labor in Great Britain," said Mr. Hobson, in discussing interesting subjects with the writer, "is confronted by several grave problems. The unemployed question is assuming tremendous proportions and there is much distress among the workers who are in enforced idleness. Then the court decisions have thrown our unionists into a state of chaos. The Taff Vale decision came like a thunder clap from a clear sky, and to-day none of the funds of our labor organizations are safe, for any employer or any blackleg can go into court and tie up the money of a union and likely secure damages. Heretofore we have been very conservative, but now an effort is being made to combine the unions and the Socialist parties for the purpose of gaining political control. You may have noticed the election recently held in the Woolrich district, where Will Crooks, the Labor candidate, was sent to Parliament, taking the seat formerly held by Sir Charles Beresford, Conservative. There is no doubt in my mind but the combined labor forces will elect at least forty men at the next general elections, which will be on soon. Labor in England is learning that its only hope is to gain possession of the government."

The trusts are playing a new game. In Astoria, Ore., a big packing company announced that it would unionize its plant and employ only white labor in its cannery. The manager of the tin can trust thereupon notified the packing company that if only union labor was employed no more cans would be sold to the Astoria concern, but if Chinese and non-union labor were employed the company could have all

the cans desired. In Omaha the employers' association withheld supplies from a concern that unionized its establishment and was injunctioned for so doing, and the matter is now in the courts. If the trusts and capitalistic associations generally make this sort of a stand it develops a new question that must be faced, and a very serious one at that. Class lines are being sharply drawn these days.

The anti-trust agitation is striking home. It will be recalled that it was stated in the Review recently that a court in Iowa had declared a teamsters' union illegal and in conflict with the anti-trust law. Then the Texas Legislature enacted a so-called anti-trust law which, according to the best constitutional attorneys in that State, can be enforced against trade unions. But the Republican politicians of New Hampshire have gone their Bourbon brethren of the Lone Star State one better and adopted a constitutional amendment and then based a law upon it, according to which labor organizations can be dissolved for interfering with "free and fair competition." In Texas 100,000 workmen petitioned the powers that be to re-enact a law legalizing unions or pass a bill declaring that labor organizations are excepted in the provisions of the anti-trust law, but they were snubbed, the governor declaring that he is "the workingman's friend," and they have nothing to fear. In New Hampshire the unions have also used up a lot of ink and paper in resolving against the politicians whom they elected, but the latter are saying nothing and putting in their time framing pretty speeches to feed workers during the next campaign. It might be added that the corrupt politicians in the Virginia Legislature are considering a bill to make it a misdemeanor for unions to persuade non-union men or scabs to leave their employment, and the "workingmen's friends" of North Carolina have steered a bill through one branch of the Legislature to fine and imprison employers for locking out employes or the latter to call a strike. And so the grind continues and the patient workers are paying dearly for their neglect in guarding their political power and "throwing it away" on capitalistic tools.

The courts seem to be working overtime in their pleasant occupation of killing labor laws, so-called. The Indiana Supreme Court, at one fell swoop, smashed the law for which the unionists of that State worked like Trojans, and spent considerable money to secure its passage, namely, the measure fixing a minimum wage for laborers on all public work. The court declared that the law was "paternalism" and "injured" labor. Having disposed of that law, the same court took up the law requiring weekly payment of wages and declared it unconstitutional. That law was also "paternalism" and "injured labor." The wise men held that labor is property and exchangeable for food and raiment and "some" comforts, and that "if the master can employ only upon terms of weekly payment the workman can find employment on no other terms." Of course, the "masters" are weeping bitter tears of disappointment because the court rescued the downtrodden from their clutches. The Illinois Supreme Court, with one swipe, smashed the law creating free employment bureaus, and now there is loud denunciation of the court, but the court don't care. In New York the

Highest court in the State knocked out the minimum, or "fair race," law some time ago and now follows it up with a decision that decries the best measure on the statute books—the eight-hour law. This law has run the gamut in New York for over a year and the "nonpapers" were laid in denunciation of the "special privileges" that it conferred just as the same highway went in Ohio when they had an eight-hour law in that State declared unconstitutional. The eight-hour and minimum-wage laws are really the only labor laws worth fighting for, and now that they are dead and buried in many of the States it looks as though the workers will gain nothing unless they cease fighting and place their own class-conscious men in the Legislatures and on the bench, coroner and inspector lines.



# SOCIALISM ABROAD

## France.

Recent events in the world of Socialism in France is of extreme interest as throwing a light on the tendency in regard to tactics. When about two years ago the Socialist movement in France was split into two hostile parties the natural inference would be that the opportunists or the Millerand wing would grow continuously more and more bourgeois in its sympathies. It was formed of those who were specifically pledged to the support of the ministerialist position, yet it was only a short time until the proletarian instinct began to assert itself, and to revolt against the tactics which were compromising its class interests. So it was that at the recent congress at Bordeaux there were a large number of local divisions of the party who came there instructed to expell Millerand who but a short time before had been designated the "undisputed" leader by Hubert de Lagardelle. Millerand had taken the position that he was responsible only to those who elected him and not to the whole Socialist party. This well-known little bourgeois position at once aroused rebellion. Then when he showed a weakness in his hostility to militarism and clericalism and in numerous ways rejected the proletarian position the number of his antagonists increased rapidly, so that when it came to the congress recently held at Bordeaux 51 out of 122 votes were in favor of expelling him from the party which was practically organized to carry out his policy.

A large number who did not feel willing to go to the length of expelling him were out of sympathy with his position so that a resolution of censure was adopted by a vote of 72 to 52. Even Jaures is showing signs of breaking with Millerand and recent numbers of *La Petite Republique* are filled with controversial articles between these hitherto inseparable political friends. According to an article by Jean Longuet in a recent number of *Neue Zeit* this action indicates the downfall of the Opportunist wing of French Socialism.

Some of the leading European Socialists, however, regard the same facts from exactly the opposite point of view from that of Longuet. Lagardelle declares that "the adversaries of Millerand are directing their blows simply against isolated facts which had violently aroused the anti-clerical and anti-ministerialist ideas of the mass of the militant workers and permit the general theory of reformist opportunism to be put absolutely to one side." As a result of this he declares that

the congress at Bordeaux has given rise to the formation of a definitely reform party.

B. Kitschewsky in an article in a later number of the *Neue Zeit* agrees in many ways with Lagardeñe. He considers that the disagreement between Jaures and Millerand to be a sham one. He also thinks that the resolution of censure being directed towards specific acts rather than the general principles of ministerialism was of little importance. This writer criticised quite sharply the lack of clearness in the Socialist philosophy of even the antagonists of Millerand. He thinks that the outcome of the congress must be, however, a split in the party which has hitherto supported Millerand and that those who leave the Millerand movement will constitute an addition to the actually revolutionary movement in France.

Edouard Vaillant in London "*Justice*" agrees that the Bordeaux Congress means the formation of a purely reform party and says:

"We could not wish for anything better than the formation of this party, and prefer that matters should no longer be ambiguous. This is better than revolutionary speeches combined with opportunist politics and a middle-class alliance. There will be more light, and that is what we want."

In consequence of the victory of Millerand many federations who have hitherto been faithful to the Ministerial Socialists now seem likely to leave them. Allemane has proposed a conference to see if there is not some *modus vivendi* possible between anti-ministerial revolutionary Socialists of all sections. The *Parti Socialiste de France* (Guesdists and Blanquists) are in a fair way to attract to themselves all that is really Socialist in France.

---

### Germany.

---

The Social Democratic members of the Reichstag have issued an appeal to the voters, from which we take the following selections: "When in the spring of 1898 we published our electoral announcements we promised to lead the battle against wrong, oppression and exploitation in every form, and to further in all possible manner the cause of progress. These promises we have faithfully kept.

"We did all that we could to right wrong, abolish violence, hinder exploitation, fight oppression, and serve the cause of progress.

"If we often failed to maintain that which we desired it was due to the smallness of our numbers, which was always opposed by an overwhelming majority.

"Unfortunately, the last five years have given only too few of the advances which we hoped to endorse with our votes, while it has brought much in the way of new burdens and oppressions for the people."

The appeal then goes on to describe the various measures which have come before the Reichstag and the attitude of the Social Democratic members in relation to them: "The continuous growth of the military and naval budget, the enactment of the hunger tariff, and the expenditure of increasing sums in colonial administrations are a few

of the movements in the interest of capitalism which have progressed in spite of the opposition of the Socialist representatives.

"The same parties and classes that continually boast of their patriotism and denounce us as 'Vaterlandless,' refuse absolutely to contribute from their great incomes and properties to the support of the army and navy, but support by their overwhelming numbers as patriotic and just the indirect taxes of all forms which bear most heavily upon the necessary means of living of the poorer classes.

"Voters! on the day the business classes of this kingdom are compelled by income and property taxes to meet the cost of the new army and navy expenses, we are at the end of their endorsement of these expenses. The patriotism of these classes will disappear and thereby they will show how superfluous these things are.

"Even in the individual states, as in the kingdom, financial distress is upon us. They can no longer see their way out. The most pressing tasks of advancing civilization suffer from lack of funds, but for new means of destruction the means are always at hand.

"And how is it with internal politics? The most pressing legal reforms, absolutely necessary social reforms, the extension of protection for laborers, decisive measures for the popular health, etc., are continuously met with the reply that it costs too much and that there is no money. Oppressive laws in relation to the press, unions and public meetings restrict the right of coalition and association of laborers, and infringe upon the personal freedom of citizens as if Germany stood, not upon the highest but upon the lowest stage of civilization.

"There is only one means of remedying all this,—and that is fighting—continuous fighting, against all who are guilty of supporting this unholy economic system, until it is overthrown.

"It is especially the task of the laboring class, which suffer the most beneath all these evils, to support with all their strength the struggle of the Social Democracy against this horrible injustice.

"The women also and especially the working women who, up until the present time are excluded from all political activity, have every reason to work for the success of the candidates of the Social Democracy.

"Even if they cannot vote, they can agitate.

"Election day shall be a day of judgment and of reckoning for those who misuse and abuse you—a day which shall also be a day of triumph from which a new and better future shall be dated.

"Remember that according to the enactment of a reactionary majority in the Reichstag you have an opportunity to go to the ballot box only once in five years.

"How seldom such a day will come into your life. See that you use it. Use it in such a manner that every one of you can say to himself, 'I have done my duty.'

"Our watchword for the election is 'Down with the present form of militarism that is sucking the life of the people.' Peace for the people.

"Down with the accursed taxation and commercial policy which presses upon the life of many men.

"Down with the taxation and tariff policy which oppresses the poor and favors the rich.

"Down with internal reaction, governmental tyranny, police oppression and judicial uncertainty.

"On with the battle for progress in every sphere, for knowledge, for freedom, for release from all the oppression which class domination and class legislation have laid upon the shoulders of the laboring masses of the people.

"Our goal is the bringing in of the Socialist state and a social order founded upon social property in the means of labor with the duty of labor for all its members, and the creation of a political and social condition in which truth, justice and equality and the welfare of all will be the guiding motive of all acts.

"Voters! Those among you who share these views, vote on the 16th of June for the candidates of the Social Democracy."

---

### Holland.

---

Our readers will remember that the subject of the general strike in Holland was thoroughly treated in our April number. The following quotation from an article by Henri Polak in London "Justice" shows the outcome of the struggle after the anti-strike bill was introduced into Parliament and the deadening effect which the mistaken action has had upon the Socialist movement of Holland.

The Liberal members pronounced themselves in favor of the bills, and the vigorous action of the Social Democratic members could not prevent the rushing of the bills through the House, as the Liberals spoke very little, and the Clerical members not at all! The debate was, therefore, limited to the Social Democrats and the two cabinet ministers in charge of the bills.

After a two days' debate, the passing of the bills was near at hand. And then the Committee of Defense resolved to order a general strike. This was a terrible mistake, and the strike was consequently a dismal failure. At Amsterdam about 25,000 men, principally the diamond workers, the building trades and the engineers, struck. But the rest remained at work. And throughout the country it was even worse. And in the evening of the very day that the general strike was proclaimed, the bills were passed, and the Committee of Defense, seeing the uselessness of any further action, ordered work to be resumed on the following day at noon.

This created a terrible storm. The diamond workers, well organized and disciplined as they are, went back to work at once. But in several other trades the men, under the influence of Anarchist leaders of the Domela Nieuwenhuis type, refused to resume work, and so disbanded, disorganized groups of men remained out for some days, without any use or purpose, without knowing why and wherefore they were doing so.

The result of all this was that hundreds of men were locked out. The railway companies have thrown out no less than 1,600 men. And about 1,000 others, spread over different trades, shared the same fate.



The shipping masters, etc., seized the opportunity, and locked out all their men (about 6,000), and would only take them back on condition that they signed an agreement whereby they had to abandon the principle of collective bargaining and to suffer the weekly deduction of a certain percentage of their wages, until a sum of about four guineas a head was deducted, which is to remain in the hands of the employers, to be forfeited in case of a strike.

The situation can be summed up as follows:

(a) The union of the railway servants (which had a membership of about 13,000) is completely smashed.

(b) The Federation of the Transport Workers is crippled, if not paralyzed, for a long time to come, and will have to face severe struggles ere it regains its former position.

(c) The whole trade union movement has suffered a severe shock, which will make itself felt for years.

(d) The Social Democratic Labor party, which, in its solidarity with the cause of threatened trade unionism, has allowed itself to join the general strike movement, has seriously imperilled its political success for some time to come.

(e) The clerical government has strengthened its position immensely, having gathered under its banner the panic-stricken middle classes of all denominations.

(f) The confessional pseudo trade unions, led and directed by the clergy, have unmistakably gained ground, and will prove a serious obstacle in the way of the trade unions proper.

(g) No progressive movement of the unions can be thought of for some time, as all their energies and their funds have to be expended in supporting the hundreds upon hundreds of destitute families of victims of the strike.

But there are also some shimmerings of light in the darkness around us. The workmen will now surely turn their backs on the Anarchists and their teachings. The idea of the general strike as a sure means of bringing about the sudden transition of the capitalist production into the Socialist will no longer be popular with the workers of Holland. And our trade unionists *pur et simple*, who would have nothing of political action, have learned a lesson they will not easily forget. They know now the limitations of trade unionism, and that there are forces in the State which cannot be adequately met with the so-called "economic action."

---

### Hungary.

The Hungarian Socialist party held its annual congress at Buda Pesth April 12 to 14th, 1903. One hundred and eighty-two delegates representing 165 branches were present. Nearly one hundred telegrams and messages of greeting were received from parts of Europe. There were delegates from some half a dozen districts, each with a different language.

The delegates met in the new Market Square, Buda Pesth, on Sunday, where they had a gathering numbering about 20,000. In honor of the delegates this gathering formed itself into a torchlight procession.

with over 2,000 torches. Banners, 100 in number, were displayed bearing appropriate mottoes, these frequently bearing some uncomplimentary reference to the Jesuits and cleries. Among those present were delegates from the Austrian and Kroatic Socialist parties. The chairman, Dr. Goldner, in his opening address, said that he was pleased to see that the delegates present were not only drawn from the industrial class, but from the ranks of agricultural labor.

In the course of remarks made by various delegates by way of reports regarding local work, etc., one delegate stated that the gendarmes had taken his train money from him to prevent his attending the conference, but he had managed to come in spite of them.

The main business of the conference was the proper organization of the party in Hungary. A draft form of organization was submitted and discussed. The four main points were: (1) Conditions of membership; (2) main committee and the local management of the organization; (3) the number of members to be in the administrative council; (4) the branch contributions to party funds. After a lengthy discussion, it was agreed that admission to membership must not only include belief in the main ground principles of Socialism, but also subscription to the program of the party. With regard to contributions, it agreed that every member should contribute a minimum monthly subscription of one penny to the party funds.

The Hungarian movement while having existed for many years has been in a very confused state. *Die Zeit*, a liberal paper, in reviewing the proceedings of the congress gives a short history of the Hungarian Socialist movement, from which we take the following facts:

The first Socialist program in Hungary was put forth in 1869, but little progress was made until recent years, owing largely to internal troubles. Another great obstacle to progress was the extreme hostility of the government. Thousands of Socialists were driven out of their homes simply because they were Socialists. The collection of money for Socialist purposes was absolutely forbidden and all such money was subject to confiscation. The leaders of the Socialists were photographed and these photographs placed in the rogues' gallery of criminals until, as the above paper says, "Hungary is in every way a land of constitutional freedom, but this freedom was only for the ruling classes." At the present time this persecution has not by any means entirely ceased. "Minor officials oppress the Social Democrats as formerly, but when this is brought to the attention of the minister of the Interior, he ordinarily corrects matters. To be sure, this is often too late, especially when the persecution takes the form of forbidding meetings."

Some idea of the growth of the party may be seen from the fact that between May, 1901, and March, 1902, the party had an income of 42,742 kronen and an expenditure of 42,149 kronen.

Some of the more prominent members of the party are Dr. Adolf Goldner and Desidor Boknyi. "For many years the Social Democracy in Hungary was simply an opposition party, but this time is now gone by and it now follows its own individual purposes." How thoroughly true this is is shown by the extracts from the platform adopted at this congress, which we take from the *Deutsches Volks*

Zeitung, published at Temesvar, Hungary. "The freedom of the laboring class can only come as the result of the struggle which shall end all class domination and abolish its foundation by transforming private property into collective property, and thereby the capitalist system of production into the socialist system of production. The freeing of the working class is the historic mission of the laboring class itself. This class struggle can only be won through the conquest of political power. The methods of this class struggle are the destruction of all portions of the people, the propaganda of Socialist aims and purposes, the political organization of the laboring class, and the furtherment of all means coinciding with the instinct of justice of the proletarian. Since class domination oppresses the proletarian of all lands, therefore its antagonism is an international task. The Hungarian Social Democracy therefore declares its party an international party and feels itself a part of the oppressed of all lands and a sharer of their battles. This battle is not for the purpose of creating a new class domination or privileges, but to abolish all privileges and to place all mankind without regard to distinction of nation, race, creed or sex upon an equality."

### Australia.

The Victorian government recently demanded of the employees of the street railways that they sever their connection with the Melbourne Trade Union on the ground that the Union was a political as well as a trade union center and that the State Railway employees being in the position of civil servants must refrain from taking part in politics.

Since last August the railway employees have had to submit to two reductions in their wages, and it appears that these reductions were accepted on the understanding that they would be of a temporary nature, to assist in meeting the loss on the working of the railroads caused by the terrible drought from which Australia has been suffering.

The workers finally struck against these conditions and the organized laborers of all Australia came to their assistance. One of the results of this is held to be a genuine Socialist movement throughout Australia and the clearing up of the distinction between Socialism and State Ownership.

The Social Democratic Federation of England is sending the following:

"The Executive Council of the S. D. F. sends fraternal greetings to the railway workers of Melbourne and heartily wishes them success in their struggle to maintain their rights as citizens against capitalist encroachments on their liberties, whether on the part of private employers or public functionaries. The Executive Council further calls attention to the fact that the mere ownership of monopolies by the present class State in the interests of the commercial classes must not be confounded with genuine Social Democracy, and by no means puts an end to the existing class antagonism; and that, in order to

achieve their emancipation, the working classes must organize themselves to acquire political power, so that they may be able to change the present class State into an organized administration for the benefit of the whole people."

---

### Italy.

---

The Socialist daily, "Avanti," has always been under the control of the opportunist wing, but recently, as this division of the party has grown weaker, it has become incapable of supporting it and its circulation decreased. Finally the old editorial staff resigned and Enrico Ferri was elected as managing editor. It is understood that the revisionists are going to start another daily at Genoa which is to be open to all so far as they "represent the cause of labor, including Anarchists and Republicans."

Meanwhile the "Avanti" published an anti-military manifesto advising the troops not to act against their fellow workers and the government is prosecuting it. The Socialist deputy Cabini recently interpolated the government in regard to the condition of the workers in the rice fields. He brought out the fact that during the season which lasts from the end of May to the beginning of July not less than 40,000 women and children were working from 12 to 14 hours per day in water up to their waists, for which they were receiving about 30 cents per day. In this connection we notice from "L'Action" that there have been hunger riots in Palermo and throughout Sicily. These have been put down by troops, many of the persons being killed and wounded.

---

### Belgium.

---

The congress of the Belgian Social Democracy was held in Brussels April 12th. Comrade Delnet in opening the congress declared: "Last year found us in the midst of the battle in which we met defeat, but the presence of 592 delegates at this congress shows that the movement is stronger than it has ever been before. The shed blood of the martyrs was good seed and has borne good fruit."

Victor Serwy reported from the co-operatives that they had made rapid progress and that during the past year ten new Maisons du Peuples had been erected.

Fournemont in reporting concerning the struggle for universal equal suffrage declared that the general strike of the year before was brought about without proper planning, and that it was, in many ways, premature but, nevertheless, his faith in the general strike as a weapon remained unshaken.

Vandervelde declared that the struggle for universal suffrage would be taken up again before the election of 1904. He attacked the position of the party organ, "Le Peuple," because it had been advocating a compromising attitude.

The treasurer's report showed an income of 11,844 francs and an expenditure of 11,150 francs during the last year.



## BOOK REVIEWS

God's Children, A Modern Allegory, by James Allman. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company. Cloth, pp. 113. 50 cents.

While the plot of this book offers nothing really new, yet as a contribution to the literature of Socialism in the true sense of that word it has few equals. It is the story of the experiences of a divine messenger sent down to earth to investigate the condition of God's children. Not being satisfied with the gods furnished by existing theology and mythology the author creates one of his own so grand and gentle that the reader feels that it would not be hard to worship him.

This being sends his messenger to find how his children on the planet Earth are getting on. The Recording Angel informs the messenger before he starts that the best place to study them will be in London, where they have congregated in such numbers. So the messenger proceeds to this city, arrives at Charing Cross, travels over the West End and then starts along the Strand and Fleet Street to Whitechapel.

The story of the contrasts which he sees is told in the most strikingly effective manner. He arrives at a place where numerous public speakers are holding forth and listens to the Salvationist, Prohibitionist and finally to the Socialist, who delivers a speech which is in itself one of the best expositions of Socialist philosophy ever put in print. The Divine messenger is convinced of the justice of Socialism and asks of the speaker if there are any opponents of this doctrine, and is referred to a professor of Political Economy, Professor Ananias Average. He visits the professor's house, discovers the perfidy and dishonesty of the professor and denounces it, whereupon the professor orders him to leave.

"Mercury turned pale with contempt and wrath. Leave! yes, but you shall leave with me. I have seen suffering and vice among the ignorant, and here I see lying and deceit where the truth should be found. I met in Whitechapel the prostitutes of their bodies; here I meet a man of intelligence who prostitutes that which is more sacred, his reason.

"The professor sprang from his seat with a threatening gesture, but Mercury, powerful in his superhuman strength, towered above him, and, seizing him by the throat, threw him out of the window."

The messenger then returns to God and makes his report, and God declares that he wishes to see the things for himself. "God leaned his head upon his hand and turned his eyes in the direction of the earth. By a slight effort his almighty mind sweeping through intervening space, he contemplated the condition of his children.

"God looked and he saw dainty ladies with pink-white faces and sensual lips sipping rich wines and casting sensual looks upon the richly-dressed men who drank and sang and smiled with them. He saw stern, hard-faced plutocrats frowning from club windows upon the passing multitude; he saw luxury; he saw pride; he saw war; he saw lust, blood, ambition and arrogance.

"God looked and he saw the pallid wife of the workless laborer putting a cup of cold water to the lips of her starving child; he saw her squalid hovel and her want-pinched face; he saw her despairing husband struggling with thousands of others as sallow-faced as himself at the dockyard gates for the work which would provide bread for his wife and little ones, and God saw him turn away workless and desperate.

"God looked and he was angry.

"God listened and he heard soft sensuous songs of pleasure; he heard laughter, light but heartless; he heard sneers and contempt expressed for the poor and lowly, and hatred uttered in bitter words by the wealth-insolvent few for the suffering and toiling many.

"God listened. He heard the deafening roar and whirr of the mighty machinery in thousands of factories, but rising loudly and plainly above it the cries and groans of the little child-slaves who tended the machines. He heard the unuttered prayer of woe from the soul of the fallen woman compelled to sell herself in order to exist; he heard the desperate, blasphemous *De Profundis* hurled at heaven by the hopeless, starving wage-slave and he heard it in magnanimous forgiveness, for he is a merciful God. God listened and was angry. Threateningly he reached forth an arm, mighty as that of a giant, graceful as that of a Grecian athlete, toward the earth, and thus he spoke in his wrath:

"Oh, my children, misguided, sinful, wretched and sad. Oh, my children, avaricious, arrogant and selfish. Unto you I gave plenty and of it you have produced poverty; unto you I gave purity and peace and you have made impurity and war; unto you I gave reason and you have abused it so that you live in a worse way than the beasts to whom I gave it not. But I am God and I shall so will it in the near future that those among you who live in idleness and work not, shall not live upon the blood and sweat of the many who toil. For I will encourage with my omnipotent will the spread of that creed of hope for my children called "Socialism," and the desperate many shall arise against the despoiling few; they shall hurl the mighty from their high places; they shall despoil the despoilers and take unto themselves the just reward of their labor—the wealth of the earth.

"And then, when in the place of want and misery there shall be peace and plenty; when in the place of sighs of slaves and cries of starving children, there shall be laughter, song and joy and peace; when equality shall succeed despotism and justice supplant partial and venal law; when men shall work each for all, and all for each, then will you not blaspheme my name when you call yourselves God's Children."

As a propaganda work, a means of arousing the unthinking to action, it is doubtful if this book has an equal in the English language.

Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy. By Frederick Engels. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company. Cloth, pp. 133. 50 cents.

This is one of the fundamental basic sort of works that needs to be read over more than once and which will richly repay every successive reading with a harvest of new ideas. The translator has made a very valuable introduction connecting the work with current thought. It is the history of the connection between Hegelianism and the Marxian philosophy of history. Feuerbach occupied a position midway between the two, forming a sort of stopping place, as it were, between Hegel and Marx.

Almost every Socialist reader knows in a sort of an indefinite way that the materialistic interpretation of history is founded upon Hegelian dialectics, but if asked to explain these terms and their connection we fear that the majority would find themselves rather troubled. Hegel showed that history had a continuity and that each institution only lived so long as it fulfilled an historic function. Since he stated this, however, in the form of the maxim "All that is real is reasonable, and all that is reasonable is real," it gave rise to two schools according to the interpretation which they put upon the word "reasonable." If by "reasonable" they understood simply existing, then the Hegelian became an iron-bound conservative. If by "reasonable" he understood fitting to a present purpose he might easily become an extreme radical.

Feuerbach sprang from the "left" wing of the Hegelians. He sought also to substitute materialism for the Hegelian idealism. Nevertheless, he in no way understood materialism in its modern sense. Because of this confusion Feuerbach became decidedly reactionary. Engels, after discussing and criticising the work of Feuerbach, proceeds to set forth the materialistic interpretation of history in perhaps as thorough a manner as either of the great masters ever expounded it.

The book as a whole is one which no person who wishes to be thoroughly grounded in Socialist philosophy can afford to neglect.

Journal of Arthur Stirling. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Cloth, pp. 356. \$1.25.

This book, which has attracted considerable attention in the public press and which is now known to be the work of Upton Sinclair, is supposed to be a description of the struggles of an author who had produced a masterpiece for which there was no great "public demand."

The author goes desperately from publisher to publisher in his efforts to dispose of it and finally commits suicide in despair. This book purports to be his diary. It is made up with rather hysterical denunciations of individuals and systems.

It is very evident that it is the tyranny of capitalism in the literary world against which he is rebelling, and his work in other lines has shown his close sympathy with Socialism, yet one cannot but wish that he had spoken a little clearer on this point. Nevertheless the work is one of sometimes startling strength and with a strange fascination which holds the reader throughout.



## NEW AND STANDARD

# Books on Socialism

---

Handsomely Bound in Cloth ... Fifty Cents Each

**God's Children.**—By JAMES ALLMAN. A Modern Allegory. One of the greatest satires on capitalist society ever written.

**Britain for the British** (America for the Americans.)—By ROBERT BLATCHFORD, author of "Merrie England." 200,000 already sold.

**The Communist Manifesto.**—By KARL MARX and FREDERICK ENGELS. Ours is the handsomest edition ever printed of this classic of Socialism.

**The Principles of Social Progress:** A Study of Civilization.—By JAMES BALE MORMAN, A. B. Extra cloth, 240 large pages.

**Letters from New America,** or An Attempt at Practical Socialism. By CLARK EDMUND PERSINGER.

## STANDARD SOCIALIST SERIES

1. **Karl Marx.** Biographical Memoirs.—By WILHELM LIEBKNECHT. Translated by Ernest Untermann.
2. **Collectivism and Industrial Evolution.** — By EMILE VANDERVELDE. Translated by Charles H. Kerr.
3. **The American Farmer.**—By A. M. SIMONS.
4. **The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association.**—By ISAAC BROOME.
5. **The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.**—By FREDERICK ENGELS. Translated by Ernest Untermann.
6. **The Social Revolution.**—By KARL KAUTSKY. Translated by A. M. and May Wood Simons.
7. **Socialism Utopian and Scientific.**—By FREDERICK ENGELS. Translated by Edward Aveling, D. Sc.
8. **Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy.**—By FREDERICK ENGELS. Translated by Austin Lewis.

---

The *International Socialist Review*, edited by A. M. Simons, is the one indispensable periodical for whoever wishes to understand socialism. Monthly, 64 pages, 10 cents a copy, \$1.00 a year. We will send the *Review* one year to a new name, and will mail any two of the books described above for one dollar, if this advertisement is mentioned.

---

Charles H. Kerr & Company. (Co-operative), 56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago